

	A	B	G
	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
1			
2	Unknown	Development Standards	Height exemptions for solar panels
3	Holland & Knight	Development Standards	Section 25.17.05 - Sidewalks: The proposed sidewalk widths are much too wide to provide space conducive to a positive pedestrian experience in many locations. Sidewalks that are too wide lack a vitality and energy that is produced in narrower, appropriately sized pedestrian areas. There is no logical basis to require an amenity/safety area of seven feet in width in between a sidewalk and the use on the property, which is often a surface parking area.
4	Holland & Knight	Development Standards	25.17.06-Shadows: General requirements regarding the shadow studies are too restrictive and contrary to the goals of transit oriented development. The proposed provision effectively restricts a development (other than a residential tower), from casting a shadow on another project. This is difficult to achieve and still obtain the densities desired in a mixed use zone. The creation of shadows is a reality of almost any type of development -- even single family homes cast shadows on neighboring single family homes. #5033941 vl
5	The JBG Companies	Development Standards, mixed use	RORZOR Provision: 25.13.07.a.3.1 The goals of this provision would seem to be to enforce a breakup in the massing for buildings with facades over a certain length, though the basis for the requirement is not indicated. These types of prescribed façade off-set requirements are no guarantee of good design and frequently will deter successful design solutions appropriate to pedestrian-oriented mixed-use neighborhoods such as the MXTD Zone. There is a strong precedence for traditional building forms in mixed-use settings that create rich, human scaled, pedestrian-oriented streetscapes and do not incorporate formulaic façade offsets such as those included in the proposed regulations. Where offsets are appropriate, their frequency, height, width, and depth need to be determined based on the specific parameters of a given building's design. As such, we recommend the elimination of this provision as façade treatments can be considered at project plan. <b><u>See JBG comments submitted 12.14.07</u></b>
6	Rockshire HOA	Development Standards, mixed use	There is concern that the Rockshire shopping center could be redeveloped with 5 stories (negative feelings on this) with condos and retail
7	Staff	Development Standards, mixed use	Limiting building height to 75 feet in MXCD means that buildings are caught between stick-built (limit to about 5 stories) and concrete/steel (not economic for less than about 8-10 stories).
8	Staff	Development Standards, mixed use	Art. 13 – consider making the provisions in 25.13.06 applicable only in the TD and CD districts
9	Land Use Attorneys	Development Standards, mixed use	Suggestion to include design guidelines but include an exception for MXE zones
10	Citizen	Development Standards, mixed use	Not in favor of heights in mixed use zones; too tall
11	Staff	Development Standards, mixed use	The Public Use Requirement might be too large
12	Linda Ekizian	Development Standards, mixed use	generally support the proposed MXB and MXT zoning recommendations. It makes good sense to allow higher densities directly adjacent to the railways, allowing re-development to create a non-residential visual and noise buffer for the neighboring commercial and residential community. While the recommended permitted uses in the MXT zones will turn some businesses from conforming to non-conforming status, I think the provisions in Article 8 will give business owners some security.
13	Env. Staff	Development Standards, mixed use	Article 13 – 25.13.04 p. 10-11: This would be a good place to include green incentives.
14	Env. Staff	Development Standards, mixed use	Article 13 – 25.13.04 p. 10-11: This would be a good place to add incentives for low income housing.
15	Env. Staff	Development Standards, mixed use	Article 13 – 25.13.05 b. 2. Figure p. 12: We need to make sure that solar panels and wind turbines/mills on roofs do not count against the height requirements here.
16	Env. Staff	Development Standards, mixed use	Article 13 – 25.13.06 a. 1. p. 14: Overhangs too – often used in green buildings on south facing windows.

	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
17	Env. Staff	Development Standards, mixed use	Article 13 – 25.13.06 a. 3. p. 15: All new structures must support roof gardens or be reflective of sunlight.
18	Env. Staff	Development Standards, mixed use	Article 13 – 25.13.06 a. 4. p. 15: Except on the roof – you actually want to use high-reflective coatings to reflect heat (either that or a green roof)
19	Env. Staff	Development Standards, mixed use	Article 13 – 25.13.06 b. 6. p. 17: 8 ft. sidewalks are a bit extreme. Maybe 5 or 6 feet tops or perhaps a maximum. Or require pervious surfaces over part of it.
20	Env. Staff	Development Standards, mixed use	Article 13 – 25.13.06 b. 8. (c) p. 18: Why masonry screens only. Add green walls here.
21	Env. Staff	Development Standards, mixed use	Article 13 – 25.13.07 b. 5. and c. 5 p. 21: Discourage the use of surface parking.
22	Env. Staff	Development Standards, mixed use	Article 15 – 25.15.02 j. 3. p. 15: Why are we “penalizing” housing for seniors with increase setbacks?
23	Env. Staff	Development Standards, mixed use	Article 16 – 25.16.03 table p. 3 - 9: Can we have maximum parking restrictions rather than minimum?
24	HDC	Development Standards, mixed use	Article 13: What is the effect of these Mixed Use areas for HD properties, such as Church St. and the B&O RR? Staff should look into potential impacts for these properties. Should there be a compatibility test? Discussion of lay-back slope, where it affected the design to the point of being actually restrictive/repetitive. [Com. van Balgooy]
25	HP Staff	Development Standards, mixed use	Exclude MXT from layback
26	The JBG Companies	Development Standards, mixed use	RORZOR Provision: 25.13.05.b.2.a and 25.13.06.a.1 The intention of limiting high-density, large scale buildings within certain zones is admirable and necessary in all zoning and planning codes; however, the restrictions set forth in Section 25.13.05 would yield inefficient building depths as well as ill-proportioned buildings within the zones specifically targeted for increased density due to their proximity to metro stations. <b><u>See JBG comments submitted 12.14.07</u></b>
27	David M. Schwarz/ Architectural Services, Inc.	Development Standards, mixed use	The maximum height of 55’-0” at the “street line” is less than what is currently allowed for Type V-A (fire-rated wood frame) construction according to the 2003 International Building Code (IBC-2003) in which a height of 60’-0” or 4 floors may be attained when the building is equipped with sprinklers (IBC Table 503). In addition, building codes typically allow for additional height when this type of construction is combined with another at the first floor (for example a retail base built within Type I or II construction). As such, we recommend a maximum building height more in line with the IBC-2003. <b><u>See JBG comments submitted 12.14.07</u></b>
28	Jon Zubiller DM	Development Standards, mixed use	The narrow range of height of 45’ to 55’ will result in a monotonous street wall and limits the visual interest that a wider range of building heights along a street can create. As such, we recommend elimination of the minimum height requirement, or at the very least, a portion of a building should have the ability to be a single storey with a parapet height in the range of 18 to 20 feet. <b><u>See JBG comments submitted 12.14.07</u></b>
29	The JBG Companies	Development Standards, mixed use	Related to the above comment, the requirement that the façade height of a development with a building length of 250 feet or more must vary “ <i>by at least 10 feet within the range of 45 to 55 feet</i> ” will force developments of these lengths to have a façade height of either 45 or 55 feet only. This limitation risks the city having sites developed with buildings containing arbitrary and ill-proportioned “bump-ups” or “cut-outs” with little relationship to the building’s design and serve only the purpose of sufficing the regulation. Further, it seems to prohibit architectural expressions and certain styles that would be in better proportion to the building but having a height less than ten feet or width of less than 25 feet. <b><u>See JBG comments submitted 12.14.07</u></b>
30	The JBG Companies	Development Standards, mixed use	The 1:1 ratio setback required to attain additional building height creates building block depths that are inefficient for their intended uses. <b><u>See JBG comments submitted 12.14.07</u></b>

	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
31	The JBG Companies	Development Standards, mixed use	It is also important to note that the issue of deep inefficient floor plates persists due to the 1:1 ratio setback of upper levels when the stepping of the façade above 55' is eliminated. <u>See JBG comments submitted 12.14.07</u>
32	The JBG Companies	Development Standards, mixed use	Buildings taller than 60' in height are required by code (IBC-2003) to be constructed of a higher (i.e. more expensive) construction type. The proposed setback requirement so diminishes the amount of building area that can be built above 60 feet that it will be economically infeasible to construct any buildings taller than 55 to 60 feet (the maximum allowable height for wood frame construction). There are few sites available with sufficient depth that would allow the 65 feet of setback that would be necessary to construct a building to 120 feet without a setback from the street line. <u>See JBG comments submitted 12.14.07</u>
33	The JBG Companies	Development Standards, mixed use	The 1:1 ratio setback coupled with the range of building height (45'/55' to 120') also presents an awkward proportion of building massing in which there is almost a 1:1 ratio of lower mass to upper mass. (see above comment on inefficient building depths) Further the city risks ending up with a proliferation of "stepped top" buildings that will draw more attention due to their unusual massing rather than their façade design. <u>See JBG comments submitted 12.14.07</u>
34	The JBG Companies	Development Standards, mixed use	Due to the inefficient building depths created by building at the "street line", the 1:1 ratio setback required to attain additional building height would also favor development that provides a substantial (up to 65'-0" or 75'-0" depending on the interpretation of "street line") setback creating an ill-defined street edge. <u>See JBG comments submitted 12.14.07</u>
35	The JBG Companies	Development Standards, mixed use	While the intent of a setback above a certain height is good (to prevent massive, looming buildings) but the effect will not be desirable. In addition to essentially relegating new development to a height range of 45 - 55', it will push any towers to the middle of a site which will not attract any good architecture and erode the street line. Our recommended approach is to limit the allowable footprint above 60' to less than 30,000 GSF. This concept has been deployed successfully in Vancouver and other cities and allows the individual site parameters and architectural design to properly locate additional height (e.g. on a busy corner or as a gateway to a site). This would also provide site-specific flexibility that could be evaluated at project plan. <u>See JBG comments submitted 12.14.07</u>
36	The JBG Companies	Development Standards, mixed use	RORZOR Provision: 25.17.05b.2 It is critical for a well planned city to create efficient, flexible and accommodating streets and sidewalks. The issues stemming from the creation of a sidewalk or street that is too narrow may include increased traffic congestion (both vehicular and pedestrian) and the inability to provide sidewalk amenities and pedestrian safety. Likewise, if a sidewalk or street is too wide, development potential will not be realized, retail will be less successful as people will not window shop and streets will seem barren tending to diminish the vitality of a neighborhood. <u>See JBG comments submitted 12.14.07</u>
37	The JBG Companies	Development Standards, mixed use	Sidewalks ranging in width from 10 to 16 feet in mixed-use commercial neighborhoods provide for good pedestrian circulation, encourage window-shopping and allow adequate room for street-side amenities and landscaping elements. The following diagram and images illustrate sidewalks within this range and therefore is our recommended sidewalk width for all zones. <u>See JBG comments submitted 12.14.07</u>
38	The JBG Companies	Development Standards, mixed use	RORZOR Provision: 25.13.06.a.1 We support the City's goal of eliminating buildings with massive scale, impersonal exterior facades, and a lack of visual interest. That said, a prescriptive requirement mandating a projection or recess every 50' on facades of 100' or greater will do very little to accomplish this and will in fact rule prevent architectural solutions that achieve the stated goal. Recesses in particular can be a detriment to a good retail streetscape since they pull the display window away from window shoppers and they also introduce small spaces along the street that present safety issues. As such, we recommend the elimination of this provision with the understanding these issues will be considered at project plan. <u>See JBG comments submitted 12.14.07</u>
39	The JBG Companies	Development Standards, mixed use	RORZOR Provision: 25.13.06.a.1, 25.13.06.a.7, 25.13.06.b.6 Few buildings, particularly in an urban setting, maintain the same level of design on all sides and uses. Historically, the level of design is dependent on the building's particular context. For example, a city hall or library in the middle of a public square might have the same level of design on all sides, whereas a building along Main Street will front the street with a the façade having the highest level of design with progressively more simplified designs fronting onto side streets, alleys and rear lot areas. This serves a number of important purposes. Changes in building façade design reinforce the hierarchy of public space within a town or city, marking the progression from principal streets to secondary streets to alleys, and rear/interior block areas. It signals to users where the front of the building (and typically the main entrance) is located. It permits the owner to spend construction dollars where they will have the most impact and benefit to the public: along the principal street(s). If all facades are designed to a similar level, the net affect will be a cheapening of principal materials to afford the cladding of all facades, and consequently, a lower level of design on those facades that face the principal streets. The use of the same architectural treatments on mechanical screens and parking garages, further exacerbates the diffi
40	The JBG Companies	Development Standards, mixed use	RORZOR Provision: 25.13.06.a.2 We are extremely supportive of guidelines that encourage building designs that respond to the pedestrian and promote visual interest and variety along the street. "Color, texture change, wall offsets, reveals and projecting ribs" are some of the ways this can be accomplished. In addition, there are a wide variety of architectural elements that can be employed to achieve these ends, including cornices and eaves, lintels, sills, band courses, pilasters, and watertables, to name a few. All of these devices need to be carefully considered and employed in a manner that reinforces the overall design for a specific building, rather than applied in an ad-hoc manner in order to comply with mandatory design guidelines. That said, a successful design can be executed with a minimum amount of these elements and an unsuccessful design can make use of lot of them. <u>See JBG comments submitted 12.14.07</u>
41	The JBG Companies	Development Standards, mixed use	As noted in <u>25.13.06.a.1</u> comments, there is considerable precedence in the design of towns and cities to progressively decrease the amount of these architectural features on secondary and rear building facades to allow for higher dollar primary facades. <u>See JBG comments submitted 12.14.07</u>

	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
42	HP Staff	Development Standards, mixed use	The layback slope provision was suggested especially for areas around St Mary's Church/. Cemetery, where the maximum height proposed would be up to 120'. We feel that this would be an appropriate provisions for any property that abuts a historic district that is not residential. Residential height restrictions will be 35', and the layback slope that is in the draft ordinance is meant to address higher density properties that would put residential areas in the shadows.
43	JBG-DMSAS	Development Standards, mixed use	The intention of limiting high-density, large scale buildings within certain zones is admirable and necessary in all zoning and planning codes; however, the restrictions set forth in Section 25.13.05 would yield inefficient building depths as well as ill-proportioned buildings within the zones specifically targeted for increased density due to their proximity to metro stations.
44	JBG-DMSAS	Development Standards, mixed use	The maximum height of 55'-0" at the "street line" is less than what is currently allowed for Type V-A (fire-rated wood frame) construction according to the 2003 International Building Code (IBC-2003) in which a height of 60'-0" or 4 floors may be attained when the building is equipped with sprinklers (IBC Table 503). In addition, building codes typically allow for additional height when this type of construction is combined with another at the first floor (for example a retail base built within Type I or II construction). As such, we recommend a maximum building height more in line with the IBC-2003.
45	JBG-DMSAS	Development Standards, mixed use	The narrow range of height of 45' to 55' will result in a monotonous street wall and limits the visual interest that a wider range of building heights along a street can create. This requirement seems counter to the goals stated in 25.13.06.a.1
46	JBG-DMSAS	Development Standards, mixed use	As such, we recommend elimination of the minimum height requirement, or at the very least, a portion of a building should have the ability to be a single storey with a parapet height in the range of 18 to 20 feet. (See Letter for pictorial alternatives)
47	JBG-DMSAS	Development Standards, mixed use	the requirement that the façade height of a development with a building length of 250 feet or more must vary "by at least 10 feet within the range of 45 to 55 feet" will force developments of these lengths to have a façade height of either 45 or 55 feet only. This limitation risks the city having sites developed with buildings containing arbitrary and ill-proportioned "bump-ups" or "cutouts" with little relationship to the building's design and serve only the purpose of sufficing the regulation. Further, it seems to prohibit architectural expressions and certain styles that would be in better proportion to the building but having a height less than ten feet or width of less than 25 feet. (See letter for explanatory illustration)
48	JBG-DMSAS	Development Standards, mixed use	The 1:1 ratio setback required to attain additional building height creates building block depths that are inefficient for their intended uses. The figures below illustrate the issues created by developing a site for either office or residential use with ground floor retail. The levels shaded in green represent building depths within a typical, economical range of development for each use. The levels shaded in yellow represent building depths on the outer boundaries of the developable range. The levels shaded in red represent building depths too narrow to economically build or too deep to be leasable. (See letter for explanatory illustration)
49	JBG-DMSAS	Development Standards, mixed use	The 1:1 ratio setback coupled with the range of building height (45'/55' to 120') also presents an awkward proportion of building massing in which there is almost a 1:1 ratio of lower mass to upper mass. (see above comment on inefficient building depths and diagrams) Further the city risks ending up with a proliferation of "stepped top" buildings that will draw more attention due to their unusual massing rather than their façade design. (See letter for photo)
50	JBG-DMSAS	Development Standards, mixed use	Due to the inefficient building depths created by building at the "street line", the 1:1 ratio setback required to attain additional building height would also favor development that provides a substantial (up to 65'-0" or 75'-0" depending on the interpretation of "street line") setback creating an ill-defined street edge. The diagrams and images below show the difference between a well-defined and ill-defined street edge.
51	JBG-DMSAS	Development Standards, mixed use	While the intent of a setback above a certain height is good (to prevent massive, looming buildings) but the effect will not be desirable. In addition to essentially relegating new development to a height range of 45 - 55', it will push any towers to the middle of a site which will not attract any good architecture and erode the street line. Our recommended approach is to limit the allowable footprint above 60' to less than 30,000 GSF. This concept has been deployed successfully in Vancouver and other cities and allows the individual site parameters and architectural design to properly locate additional height (e.g. on a busy corner or as a gateway to a site). This would also provide site-specific flexibility that could be evaluated at project plan.
52	JBG-DMSAS	Development Standards, mixed use	It is critical for a well planned city to create efficient, flexible and accommodating streets and sidewalks. The issues stemming from the creation of a sidewalk or street that is too narrow may include increased traffic congestion (both vehicular and pedestrian) and the inability to provide sidewalk amenities and pedestrian safety. Likewise, if a sidewalk or street is too wide, development potential will not be realized, retail will be less successful as people will not window shop and streets will seem barren tending to diminish the vitality of a neighborhood. (See letter for explanatory images)
53	JBG-DMSAS	Development Standards, mixed use	Sidewalks ranging in width from 10 to 16 feet in mixed-use commercial neighborhoods provide for good pedestrian circulation, encourage window-shopping and allow adequate room for street-side amenities and landscaping elements. The following diagram and images illustrate sidewalks within this range and therefore is our recommended sidewalk width for all zones. The sidewalk widths shown are supported by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) in their publication An ITE proposed Recommended Practice: Context Sensitive Solutions in Designing Major Urban Thoroughfares for Walkable Communities. (See appendix for table)
54	JBG-DMSAS	Development Standards, mixed use	The intention of not permitting parking in front of buildings is correct in order to avoid the type of development closely associated with suburban strip malls. However, the viability of ground floor retail uses is contingent on the provision of quick, easily accessible on-street parking in front of their location.
55	JBG-DMSAS	Development Standards, mixed use	Within the MXTD zone there exists a wide variety of street types and levels of service that do not currently allow for on-street parking (e.g. the wide, heavily-trafficked Rockville Pike and the narrower Halpine Street). The following images and associated diagrams illustrate our recommendations for providing additional parking in front of a building while maintaining the sense of a pedestrian-friendly, community street.



	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
56	JBG-DMSAS	Development Standards, mixed use	We support the City's goal of eliminating buildings with massive scale, impersonal exterior facades, and a lack of visual interest. That said, a prescriptive requirement mandating a projection or recess every 50' on facades of 100' or greater will do very little to accomplish this and will in fact rule prevent architectural solutions that achieve the stated goal. Recesses in particular can be a detriment to a good retail streetscape since they pull the display window away from window shoppers and they also introduce small spaces along the street that present safety issues. (see letter for explanatory images)
57	JBG-DMSAS	Development Standards, mixed use	Few buildings, particularly in an urban setting, maintain the same level of design on all sides and uses. Historically, the level of design is dependent on the building's particular context. For example, a city hall or library in the middle of a public square might have the same level of design on all sides, whereas a building along Main Street will front the street with a the façade having the highest level of design with progressively more simplified designs fronting onto side streets, alleys and rear lot areas. This serves a number of important purposes. Changes in building façade design reinforce the hierarchy of public space within a town or city, marking the progression from principal streets to secondary streets to alleys, and rear/interior block areas. It signals to users where the front of the building (and typically the main entrance) is located. It permits the owner to spend construction dollars where they will have the most impact and benefit to the public: along the principal street(s).
58	JBG-DMSAS	Development Standards, mixed use	If all facades are designed to a similar level, the net affect will be a cheapening of principal materials to afford the cladding of all facades, and consequently, a lower level of design on those facades that face the principal streets. The use of the same architectural treatments on mechanical screens and parking garages, further exacerbates the difficulty in affording high quality building skins. We strongly recommend removal of these provisions as they will clearly have the opposite effect from the city's intent and architectural treatments can be considered at project plan.
59	JBG-DMSAS	Development Standards, mixed use	Sec. 25.13.05.b.2.(a): The goals of this provision would seem to be to enforce a breakup in the massing for buildings with facades over a certain length, though the basis for the requirement is not indicated. These types of prescribed façade off-set requirements are no guarantee of good design and frequently will deter successful design solutions appropriate to pedestrian-oriented mixed-use neighborhoods such as the MXTD Zone. There is a strong precedence for traditional building forms in mixed-use settings that create rich, human scaled, pedestrian-oriented streetscapes and do not incorporate formulaic façade offsets such as those included in the proposed regulations. Where offsets are appropriate, their frequency, height, width, and depth need to be determined based on the specific parameters of a given building's design.
60	IPI/Cong	Development Standards, mixed use	25.13.05.b Minimum Height Requirement. The concept of the "build to line" is excellent. This will bring order and conformity to the streetscape and help foster a pedestrian friendly environment. The build to line is a far more important requirement in accomplishing this goal than requiring that a building be a certain height. Note however, that we are confused as to the location of the build to line and it should be clarified. Rockville Pike is a unique environment composed of small, medium , large lots, shallow lots, operating small businesses, retail and office developments. A one size fits all minimum height requirement seems inappropriate. Economically it may not be appropriate for the site or individual and it could have a disastrous impact on the small business owners should they be in a situation where redevelopment is required. One goal of the master plan is to allow flexibility in dealing with market conditions. The minimum height requirement contradicts this goal and may create an environment that will force a property owner to live with an outdated and aesthetically inferior facility since redevelopment will not be feasible.
61	IPI/Cong	Development Standards, mixed use	25.13.05.b.1 Side and Rear Setbacks. The draft zoning code requires the setback be 25' or the height of the building if adjacent to residential. Note that many lots on Rockville Pike have physical constraints. Should the City wish redevelopment to occur, these setbacks should reflect these conditions or other options should be allowed such as landscape/fence barriers.
62	IPI/Cong	Development Standards, mixed use	25.13.05.b.1 Public Space Dedication. The code requires 20% of the land area be dedicated to public use. While we support the idea of public amenity space, the requirement is excessive and will place a serious burden on the business, property owners, the City and the taxpayers who will be footing the bill to maintain these areas. We suggest that the language in the code be modified to reflect the existing code of 10% open space. The code states that "the public space must be arranged in a manner that facilitates public access and use." The special design regulations state that "buildings in the MXCD zone should be located at the front property line or the build to line where established by the master plan. " These statements are contradictory. For many projects, public space in the interior of the lot could pose various problems such as security. Open space should be counted as part of any public space requirement. Depending on the configuration/ use of the site and the location of the public space, open space may be more appropriate than public space. Also any public space requirement should include the 30' sidewalk cross section required by the MXCD zone.
63	IPI/Cong	Development Standards, mixed use	As with some of the other requirements contemplated in the mixed use zones, a standard dedication may not be applicable to all lots on the Pike due to lot size, ownership, use, etc. More detail of the fee in lieu program should be provided. Note smaller properties are more difficult to develop for many reasons. An additional tax for public space will make it more difficult from a financial point of view and could result in property owners being unable to redevelop. Recommendations for public spaces on Rockville Pike should be based on a review of the entire area which will be done during the master plan process. Should land be required for public space, the City should purchase this land.
64	Environment Commission	Development Standards, mixed use	25.13.06 – Aesthetic guidelines do not discuss the use of solar panels, wind turbines or collection tanks. These types of renewables and energy saving features should be addressed.
65	Environment Commission	Development Standards, mixed use	25.13.07 – Numerous limiting factors regarding fenestrations; however there is not an exception to allow day lighting techniques or electric glass options.
66	Twinbrook Post Office LLC	Development Standards, mixed use	We maintain that the TNP is the opportunity to create a development strategy on this retail site that meets the mission of the plan and the community into the future. For many years we have been in a stable equilibrium with our residential neighbors and we want to continue this. We firmly believe the current zoning height restrictions do protect our residential neighbors and still allow redevelopment. The major concern we have is that because of the small size and narrowness of our site, lowering the building height by an amount will significantly reduce the feasibility of redevelopment of our site. There is a threshold below which redevelopment just does not make sense, A change in building height could have the unanticipated consequence that a property that cannot economically support redevelopment will just be 20 years older in 20 years.

	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
67	Twinbrook Post Office LLC	Development Standards, mixed use	Although we strongly disagree with changing the building heights, because of our frontage on a major road with public transportation, we fully agree with the TNP in support of zoning that would encourage mixed use redevelopment. Rather than creating hardship for our residential neighbors, a well designed mixed use redevelopment on Veirs Mill would enhance the streetscape, provide living or workspace on significant public transportation routes and would provide the possibility of modern neighborhood retail space within walking distance of public transport and residential neighborhoods.
68	Holland & Knight	Development Standards, mixed use	Build-to-lines - 70% build-to-line is too restrictive; reduces flexibility in design
69	Holland & Knight	Development Standards, mixed use	Minimum Height - Imposition of minimum heights precludes any type of single-story building (e.g., bank; filling station) unreasonable to require a minimum. Minimums should be eliminated.
70	IPI/Cong	Development Standards, mixed use	Height Limitations at Streetline. The code states that facades joining the public right of way are limited to heights between 35' and 45'. Please refer to the new Town Center development and other new buildings such as 11 North Washington Street, 21 Church Street, One Church Street and 111 Rockville Pike. All projects are in excess of 45' at the property line. None of these projects would comply with zoning code as written. Please explain what elements of these projects the City is trying to avoid through regulation and why.
71	IPI/Cong	Development Standards, mixed use	It would be helpful for the City to give examples of where this type of setback has been successfully implemented in a similar setting.
72	IPI/Cong	Development Standards, mixed use	Would suggest one build to line for all building heights. Essentially the 75' height limitation will result in 6 story buildings. Does the size and mass of a 6 story building truly merit an upper story set back? If the City is committed to this concept, would suggest a single setback for the upper 3 stories rather than a staggered setback which will result in buildings like 110 North Washington Street. If a single set back is implemented, the requirement should be flexible enough to respect basic building design guidelines and site constraints.
73	IPI/Cong	Development Standards, mixed use	25.13.05.b.2(d) 30 Degree Layback. In the meeting with staff, it was discussed that this requirement applies to commercial properties abutting all residential including multifamily. The proposed code states this applies to detached and semi-detached development adjacent to commercial. Please provide clarification. A 30 degree layback requirement seems arbitrary. From a practical point of view, does a 30 degree layback have less impact on a neighboring development than a 45 degree layback? At what point does the structure become visually intrusive? Also the requirement does not address the building's orientation. It is our opinion that a six story building is not substantial enough to merit these types of requirements. Note that the smaller properties along the railroad could be seriously impacted by this requirement. Should the burden be too onerous, property owners will be discouraged from redevelopment or renovation.
74	IPI/Cong	Development Standards, mixed use	25.13.06 Additional Design Guidelines. As we have seen in Rockville in the past, specific guidelines such as these can result in poorly executed development. Would suggest the goals be stated as recommendations. Allow experienced architects to propose creative solutions. It appears that the code will require architectural treatments to all four sides of the building. This will work for some buildings and not others. Each project does have a finite budget. Let the designer and developer have the flexibility to put the money where it is required and it will count the most.
75	IPI/Cong	Development Standards, mixed use	25.13.07.b Building Location. This section should be clarified to address properties with multiple buildings/and or more than one street frontage. A fixed requirement or 70% will not work for all lot configurations and could result in poorly executed developments.
76	IPI/Cong	Development Standards, mixed use	25.13.07.b Parking. The code requires that structured parking not be visible from a public right of way or public transitway. Does the public transit way refer to potential transit in Rockville Pike or the existing railroad/Metro? As the City discovered in town center there are circumstances where it is difficult to avoid visible parking. Parking structures should be addressed on a site by site basis. Also note that the properties along the railroad are very narrow with grade considerations and could make this requirement very difficult to achieve. Once again if the requirement is financially unrealistic, the property owners will not be able to redevelop.
77	IPI/Cong	Development Standards, mixed use	Sidewalks. Does the City intend for the master plan process on Rockville Pike to dictate the sidewalk requirements or will areas on Rockville Pike fall under 25.17.05.b.2? If we do fall under this, the zoning code is establishing the build to line to be 30' from the curb. The suggested 30' sidewalk section is detached from the parking area which by definition is behind the building. To connect these two areas functionally would require multiple pedestrian paths through the building. This would severely restrict the first floor design of the building. Note with no on street parking, the short stop shopper will be discouraged and could shop elsewhere.
78	IPI/Cong	Development Standards, mixed use	Utilities. Currently states "equipment must be placed underground or enclosed in a building." Change to "enclosed in a structure.", ie 11 North Washington Street.
79	IPI/Cong	Development Standards, mixed use	Shadows and Screening. Further studies are required on these items once the larger issues above are addressed.
80	IPI/Cong	Development Standards, mixed use	A zoning code that respects the practical, physical and financial facts of redevelopment will encourage and foster good and appropriate redevelopment. The code as proposed will likely do the opposite and therefore redevelopment will not occur in the desired manner. The City has a team on board now can help with this process for the Rockville Pike corridor. It was our understanding that designing a form based code implementation tool is part of the master plan process.

	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
81	IPI/Cong	Development Standards, mixed use	Flexibility is the key to successful implementation. The proposed zoning code is extremely rigid. Under these circumstances the redevelopment may not occur and what does occur could be sporadic.
82	Holland & Knight	Development Standards, mixed use	Public Use Space requirements encourage small, underutilized spaces; consolidation should be encouraged which will result in meaningful open space; built-to-lines and public use space requirements work at cross purposes and create design challenges; requirements to vary faade heights on facades greater than 250 feet in length unnecessarily dictates design.
83	Holland & Knight	Development Standards, mixed use	(a)(b) MXTD and MXCD Zones - Minimum and maximum height range adjoining public street in MXTD and MXCD preclude liner buildings because minimum height is too high. Minimum height should be lower. Maximum MXTD should be increased to 60 feet - given standard floor-to-ceiling heights - 55 feet will accommodate only 1/2 a story. Similar issue pertains to 45 feet for MXCD Zone. 1:1 building setback creates undesirable urban form (pyramids) and limits density in areas near metro where increased densities should be encouraged.
84	Holland & Knight	Development Standards, mixed use	MXE Zone - Setback provision requiring setbacks to be 1/2 the height for buildings over 45 feet result in suburban style design. Unnecessary to have such significant setbacks. Difference in setback requirements for buildings 45 feet (3 stories) in height versus buildings greater than 45 feet is significant and unnecessary. Setback requirement severely restricts MXE development.
85	Holland & Knight	Development Standards, mixed use	Unnecessary to require demarcation between public sidewalk and private entry for residential buildings. Recommended raising of ground level presents ADA compliance issue.
86	Holland & Knight	Development Standards, mixed use	Precluding interim access between commercial and residential is an interior design issue that need not be dictated by Zoning Ordinance.
87	Holland & Knight	Development Standards, mixed use	Avoid "impersonal appearance" - subjective requirement to break up building walls greater than 100 feet may preclude desirable design
88	Holland & Knight	Development Standards, mixed use	Imposing comparable architectural treatments on all facades imposes unnecessary cost and in many cases does not convey a public benefit
89	Holland & Knight	Development Standards, mixed use	Detailed features - "contribute to visual interest" - subjective
90	Holland & Knight	Development Standards, mixed use	Roofs - Must complement the architectural and visual character - significantly limits design options; subjective
91	Holland & Knight	Development Standards, mixed use	Materials and color - "aesthetically pleasing" - subjective; outside scope of Zoning Ordinance to dictate materials and color
92	Holland & Knight	Development Standards, mixed use	Limitations on location of antennas and satellite dishes may severely restrict functionability of this equipment.
93	Holland & Knight	Development Standards, mixed use	Entryways - "aesthetically pleasing" - subjective
94	Holland & Knight	Development Standards, mixed use	Outdoor sales - outdoor sales area should not be counted toward density. Density is a measurement of mass bulk and height. Outdoor surface sales do not present any physical form.
95	Holland & Knight	Development Standards, mixed use	Pedestrian flows - internal sidewalks do not need to be 8 feet in width. Often unnecessary; increases impervious surface.
96	Holland & Knight	Development Standards, mixed use	MXTD Building location — Requires building to be constructed at front property line; precludes retail parking in front of retail building which is desirable - parking provides potential buffer from Rockville Pike; provision is inconsistent with 70% building setback requirement of 25.13.05.

	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
97	Holland & Knight	Development Standards, mixed use	MXTD Ground floor - precludes 100% residential building. Successful mixeduse project does not require every building to be mixed-use. Complete horizontal integration of uses should not be required.
98	Holland & Knight	Development Standards, mixed use	MXTD Facades - Ten-foot variations in height should clarify that the variation can be ten feet higher or lower than 45 feet (see earlier comment on Section 25.13.05b.2. addressing approvals of 45' height). Specified offsets for fa9ades more than 200' provide unnecessary detail dictating the design.
99	Holland & Knight	Development Standards, mixed use	MXTD Fenestration - Requirement for individual framed windows unnecessarily dictates and limits design.
100	Holland & Knight	Development Standards, mixed use	MXCD Building location - how is this provision reconciled with 25.13.05 requiring 70% of building to be constructed at building line?
101	Holland & Knight	Development Standards, mixed use	MXCD Facades - See MXTD comments above regarding Fa9ades and Fenestration.
102	Holland & Knight	Development Standards, mixed use	MXE Facades - "building fa?ade is normally minimum of 20 feet high." How does this correlate with development standard requiring minimum of 20 feet in heights?
103	Citizen	Development Standards, mixed use	Page 13-17: 25.13.06 b 7. Should encourage cut-away bus stops to take them off the streets when they pick up or discharge passengers.
104	Citizen	Development Standards, mixed use	Page 13-18: 25.13.b 8 (b). 50 feet is nothing!
105	Environment Commission	Development Standards, Non-Residential	Suggested lowering maximum parking spaces required for non-residential uses
106	Environment Commission	Development Standards, Non-Residential	Create incentives for "paving" with pervious parking surfaces
107	Land Use Attorneys	Development Standards, Non-Residential	Recommended increasing heights in non-residential zones. Presented the argument that ULI etc says as long as the design is good, it is ok to build higher
108	Rockville Bicycle Advisory Committee	Development Standards, Non-Residential	Some members were not opposed to raising buildings in non-residential zones
109	Env. Staff	Development Standards, Non-Residential	Article 12 – 25.12.02 table –commercial use on less than 5 acres p. 1:This seems problematic for large mixed-use developments. Should be much larger than 5 acres, maybe 20?
110	Env. Staff	Development Standards, Non-Residential	Article 12 – 25.12.04 Table p. 6: We need to be able to offer height incentives for green building features. Green buildings are usually designed to be taller and slimmer because the use more natural lighting. Will this restrict that or will a separate ordinance modify the zoning?



	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
111	Env. Staff	Development Standards, Non-Residential	Article 12 – 25.12.04 p. 7: This would be a good section to add incentives for green roofs and gray water use.
112	Env. Staff	Development Standards, Non-Residential	Article 13 – 25.13.05 c. p. 14: Why doesn't the commercial zone have all of these additional design guidelines? Many of them seem applicable to commercial.
113	Env. Staff	Development Standards, Non-Residential	Article 17 – 25.17.05 b. table p. 5: The clear path area seems high all around here, especially the 10 ft for the 4+ lanes. This will greatly increase runoff and exacerbate water quality issues. If need to keep this number, incentivize or require permeable pavement.
114	Env. Staff	Development Standards, Non-Residential	Landscaping and lighting Section 4, d. p. 3: Overall comment – not sure if the ordinance is the correct place for this, but we need to encourage bioretention and other stormwater management facilities on or near parking lots. To the greatest extent possible, we should require use of shrubs and vegetation not replace it with fences or berm. We should require planting of only native plants and trees.
115	Env. Staff	Development Standards, Non-Residential	Landscaping and lighting Section 4, d. 2 (c) p. 4: Don't prescriptive with the vegetation type. Require native plants and state the goal, i.e. aesthetics and shade, and let people plant what they want.
116	Env. Staff	Development Standards, Non-Residential	Landscaping and lighting Section 4, d. 2 (e) p. 4: Use of native plants and ground cover should be required or at least incentivised.
117	Env. Staff	Development Standards, Non-Residential	Landscaping and lighting Section 5, f. 1 and 2 p. 9: Use "dark sky" shading to avoid light pollution.
118	HDC	Development Standards, Non-Residential	Also, pay attention to archaeology and think about the scope/effect/intention. Staff noted that Article 66b and City practice reflects concern for archaeological resources on City-owned/ controlled property, but not private property. Regarding #3 on Art 14/page 2, there should be no exception.
119	Environment Commission	Development Standards, Non-Residential	25.12.03 – Use and zone table limits general and professional offices to a conditional use limited to 25% of the gross floor area of a building for commercial and light industrial zones. This pretty much limits this type of space in these areas.
120	Recs & Parks	Development Standards, Park zone	Come up with a set of development standards for heights, setbacks, etc., with exceptions for items like golf safety fences, stadium lights, etc.
121	Unknown	Development Standards, Residential	Look at provisions for handicapped access in residential
122	Staff	Development Standards, Residential	For qualifying substandard lots, consider making a provision for the minimum setbacks in subsection b, along with height and coverage standards
123	Staff	Development Standards, Residential	Setbacks from unimproved rights-of-way – Include provision for accessory structures?

	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
124	Staff	Development Standards, Residential	Article 11 – Note that the current provision requiring detached dwellings to follow the R-60 standards would not allow zero-lot-line units to be built.
125	Staff	Development Standards, Residential	A comment has been received to consider including a minimum amount of landscape area in the RMD-10 zone. Consider what Montgomery County requires (50% green area)
126	Environment Commission	Development Standards, Residential	Are the HOAs in conflict with the proposed new Standards? Can they be forced to conform with FAR & Impervious Surfaces Provisions
127	Citizen	Development Standards, Residential	25% of pervious surface requirement might be too low
128	Citizen	Development Standards, Residential	How to measure height for accessory apartments?
129	Citizen	Development Standards, Residential	Concern that current code still allows garages to dominate households. Concern that garages could eventually consume the entire first floor which would be out of character for the neighborhood
130	Staff	Development Standards, Residential	It is necessary to create special development standards for qualifying substandard lots
131	HDC	Development Standards, Residential	How will layback slope affect historic resources? Should there be any adjustments if the zone abuts or includes historic resources?
132	Staff	Development Standards, Residential	Could current pipestems that are not developed be used for public spaces?,
133	Staff	Development Standards, Residential	Certified Surveys may be too expensive to require; Can GIS images substitute
134	Env. Staff	Development Standards, Residential	Wherever possible we should be promoting the idea of clustered development. Where house or facility construction is concentrated in one area and the remainder of the area is left as a more natural corridor. This would be applicable for new developments but also for larger-scale redevelopments.
135	Env. Staff	Development Standards, Residential	Article 3 – Decks p. 11: Why must a deck only be attached to a dwelling? Restaurants and industrial facilities could have decks.
136	Env. Staff	Development Standards, Residential	Article 3 – 25.03.03 Swimming pool, min deck size p. 41: We may want to get rid of our minimum deck size for pools or require pervious pavements, concrete or asphalt.
137	Env. Staff	Development Standards, Residential	Article 9 – 25.09.05 8 p. 4: Add streamside setbacks for water quality ordinance.
138	Env. Staff	Development Standards, Residential	Article 9 – 25.09.06 p. 6: Roof top structures like solar panels or passive solar water heating equipment could add too much height for this ordinance. Additionally they may need to cover more than 255 of the roof to be effective and they may not be set back from the roofs edge. These solar energy structures need to be exempted.
139	Env. Staff	Development Standards, Residential	Article 9 – 25.09.06 p. 6: We need to include exemptions for solar panels, PV arrays, passive solar (for water heating), green roof features (the vegetation would cover more than 25% of the roof), onsite wind power generation through small wind turbines, wind towers, etc.

	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
140	Env. Staff	Development Standards, Residential	Article 10 – overall comment: Are these lot sizes consistent with what is currently at these locations? In other words, if there were a major redevelopment would we end up with bigger lot sizes than we have now? I don't want to force bigger lot sizes during large-scale redevelopment without requiring a percentage to be natural habitat (not just lawn coverage but more native habitat).
141	Env. Staff	Development Standards, Residential	Article 10 – 25.10.11 p. 8: Add water Quality setbacks/buffers outlined in the water quality protection ordinance.
142	Env. Staff	Development Standards, Residential	Article 11 – 25.11.04 table p. 4: Are the RMD and the RLD a barrier to “cluster” redevelopment? If so, is there a way we can promote that concept or make exemptions for large-scale redevelopers who are willing to cluster development and preserve or redesign wildlife habitat?
143	Env. Staff	Development Standards, Residential	Article 11 – 25.11.04 p. 5: Similar to the concept of authorizing an increase in the maximum number of dwelling units for moderate price there should also be allowable increases for green roofs, preserved wildlife habitat and other innovative stormwater management techniques as well as green building and energy efficiency features.
144	Env. Staff	Development Standards, Residential	Article 11 – 25.11.06 p. 5: The set backs for townhouse developments seem high. We would prefer to see the townhouses closer to the road and more continuous open space on the overall site.
145	Env. Staff	Development Standards, Residential	Article 17 – 25.17.06 p. 5: We want to encourage cluster development. Does this shadow requirement get in the way of that?
146	Env. Staff	Development Standards, Residential	Article 21 – 25.21.07 p. 3: We want to encourage “cluster” development whenever possible. This helps preserve wildlife corridors and global biodiversity. We should have an easy method by which developers can implement this cluster methodology.
147	Env. Staff	Development Standards, Residential	Article 21 – 25.21.16 b. 8. p. 14: Why such a big diameter for cul-de-sac. If you need it to be that big, can we require a rain garden, bio-retention facility, or permeable pavement to be placed in the center where cars will not be driving?
148	HDC	Development Standards, Residential	Article 10: Mansionization article was a balancing act for RORZOR. The FAR was added to address current neighborhood concerns about size/scale/massing and imperviousness. This seems practical and appropriate. [Com. Moloney]
149	JWH Staff	Development Standards, Residential	DPW has concerns with lots below the street with regards to drainage. We try to get the front half of the lot to drain to the street
150	Environment Commission	Development Standards, Residential	Table 25.10.05 – “Internal sidewalks up to 4 feet wide are excluded from the impervious surface requirement” (Shouldn't this type of permanent feature be included.
151	Environment Commission	Development Standards, Residential	25.10.08.C – limiting the height to 32 feet may not work in all neighborhoods. It appears section D should apply to all projects.
152	Environment Commission	Development Standards, Residential	25.10.08.D – Since this section discusses the light and air easement it should be required for all projects.
153	Citizen	Development Standards, Residential	For residential neighborhoods, height of all structures should be measured to the peak of the structure. In the RORZOR draft, heights of houses for certain residential zones are measured to the peak of a roof. This does not apply to accessory structures. The method of measuring height by using the peak of the roof should be applied to accessory structures as well as houses. The logic of measuring height by measuring the halfway point from the peak to the gable is not understood by a layperson and seems arcane. Rockville should consider dispensing with this type of measure entirely.
154	Citizen	Development Standards, Residential	. Page 11-4: Rows for RMD-15 and RMD - 25. No maximum acreage?
155	Env. Staff	Edit/Organization	Article 12 – 25.12.03 a. p. 2: Change single unit residential zones to commercial and industrial zones.

	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
156	Env. Staff	Edit/Organizatio n	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5:Fixe lines in title row
157	Env. Staff	Edit/Organizatio n	Article 13 – 25.13.08 c. p. 25: numbering for "c." is incorrect
158	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 10 – 25.10.03 table p. 1: Title row needs to iinclude abbreviated zone names, R-200, R-75, etc
159	Unknown	Editing/Organiz ation	Need to add residential designations to the use tables of the residential zones
160	HDC	Editing/Organiz ation	Consistent spelling of archaeology
161	HDC	Editing/Organiz ation	Add article title after reference to section number
162	HDC	Editing/Organiz ation	review provisions of sec. 25.14.d.1.(c) per Environmental Guidelines for under 50 years
163	HDC	Editing/Organiz ation	review provisions for CoP in sec. 25.14.01.d.3.(b)
164	Recs & Parks	Editing/Organiz ation	In lieu of the use description for park-related uses in the table, come up with a new definition for Art. 3, and keep the table entry simple
165	Recs & Parks	Editing/Organiz ation	put the park use entry first in the table as its own category
166	Recs & Parks	Editing/Organiz ation	Beef up the purposes of the zone—include reference to the various types of parks: urban, recreational, stream valley, etc
167	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Typos found: Art. 7, p. 6, Sec. 25.07.03.i., reference should be Section 25.04.06.c
168	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 9, p.1, chart, regulation for Front Yard should state ...must be located in rear yard except as provided...
169	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	change the zoning designations from R-E and R-S to R-400 and R-200.
170	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Typos found: Title of article – Home-based...
171	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 14, p.12, subsection 5 - ...for which an amendment is sought. Subsection (b) – reference should be to subsection d.6 below
172	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	typos: Article 6 – Title in Table of Contents should be Procedures for Map... OK in body of text.
173	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 7 – Table of Contents should read: Site and Project Plan, Special Exception Review, and Other Permits/Approvals. Same change needed in body of text.
174	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Nonconformity Alterations moved to Article 8
175	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 3 – Need to add definition of pipe stem lot
176	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 3 – Consider moving the sign area requirements into Article 18
177	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 7 – May need to try and clarify how the point calculation table is supposed to work.
178	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 8 – Consider moving the transitional provisions to Article 5, or at least add in a purpose statement as to what this section is supposed to do
179	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 9, p. 3, item d.3, Plant should be plural

	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
180	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 14 – Sec. 25.14.02, Districts should be plural in title. On page 12, subsection 5, the last line, amended should amendment. In subsection (b), third line, the reference should be to subsection d.6, not d.5. Legal should take a look again at this whole subsection to make sure it says what it intends to say
181	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 16 – Still should consider doing a "Parking Manual" to cover designs standards for sizes of spaces, construction standards, bike parking provisions
182	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 18 – Need to confirm with Tami that the sign illustrations are the right ones, in the right locations
183	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 21 – Need to tie the preliminary plan approval process to the site plan approval process in Art. 7
184	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 3 – Consider adding in references to historic and archaeological resources in the definition of site plan
185	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Make sure that the definition of FAR is consistent with other floor area measures – net vs. gross lot area, etc
186	Forestry	Editing/Organiz ation	In upper-story setback diagrams, show street trees.
187	Robin Ziek	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 14/page 2 item 1© should read: The filing of an application for demolition permit for any property 50 years of older, or possessing historic significance. Please refer to the Environmental Guidelines for the exact language.
188	Land Use Attorneys	Editing/Organiz ation	25.08.06 Needs a purpose statement
189	Rockville Bicycle Advisory Committee	Editing/Organiz ation	Does the definition of Class I, II, III match the County's definitions?
190	Rockville Bicycle Advisory Committee	Editing/Organiz ation	Bicycle Facility/Station: What is this?
191	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Suggestion to move transitional provisions to the very first article , provisions could also be copied to the first article while staying in its original location
192	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Rename Article 10 Low Density Residential Zones with " Single Unit Detached Residential Zone"
193	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Check to see if temporary Encroachment follows land/transfer
194	HDC	Editing/Organiz ation	Clarify with City Attorney that proposed definition for demolition does not conflict with State Legislature, Article 66B
195	HDC	Editing/Organiz ation	Remove the provision that specifies that HDC only has jurisdiction over structures that are visible from Right of Way
196	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Why are the City's standards with regards to the APFO not in sync with the County's standards? APFO should be connected to the County or the CIP
197	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	APFO: Why 2 years for conditional approval
198	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Are there conditions in cluster developments that could create a pipestem lot?
199	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Add definition for pipestem lot
200	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	25.21.08.05 should include existing historic districts and identified archeological sites



	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
201	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 1: Vested Zoning rights- add a footnote to state vesting rights.
202	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 3: There's a suggestion to hyperlink the definitions to their occurrences in the ordinance in the electronic version
203	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Notification should be in Plain English
204	Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Special exceptions needs to include what's required under Article 66B
205	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Throughout the document, always clarify zones with their abbreviations (i.e., r-400, r-150, etc) rather than saying "any residential zone where single unit detached or semi-detached development exists."
206	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 1, purpose section: · We should build: Energy-efficiency; Support the City's Green Building Program; and Walkable neighborhoods into this section.
207	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 1 – 25.01.06 Compliance: Except by special exception or variance
208	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 1 – 25.01.09 Vested Zoning Rights b. 2:"Application to any uncompleted construction of an amendment to any building code (including but not limited to fire, life safety, plumbing, electric, mechanical codes and "green building codes)..."
209	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 3 – Chief of Planning p. 9: In case CPDS is ever re-organized, should you put in some phrase saying in essence, "these people or their equivalent"?
210	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 3 – Hazardous material p. 15:Why just workplace? Why not just "released"?
211	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 3 – Hazardous material p. 15: "...poses a significant present or potential hazard to human health and safety or to the environment if released in the home, workplace or the environment."
212	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 3 – Heavy Industrial uses p. 16:"Production of service operations that require heavy machinery and may produce air or water pollution, dust, noise, smoke..."
213	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 3 – Impervious p. 17: The water quality ordinance (Ch. 23.5) has the most up-to-date definition of imperviousness and impervious area. We should use those definitions here.
214	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 3 – Impervious p. 17: We should delete the exemption for "internal sidewalks up to 4 ft wide" in this definition.
215	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 3 – Improvement, public p. 17: "Any or all of the following: roads and streets, alleys, grading, road pavement, fire hydrants, curbs and gutters, sidewalks, crosswalks and pedestrian paths, water mains, sanitary sewer lines, (water supply and sewage disposal, storm sewer lines = remove) storm drains and drainage structures, rain gardens, stormwater swales, curb returns, sidewalks..."
216	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 3 – Junk yards p. 17: Will this prevent temporary recycling activities? Can we specifically exclude that from the definition?
217	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 3 – rec and sports facility p. 25: Recreational & sports facility indoor, commercial- ....change "or" to "on"
218	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 3 – Restaurant p. 25: The Water Quality Protection Ordinance (WQPO) (Ch. 23.5) deals with "food service establishments", as churches, golf courses, etc. They have food service areas without being considered "restaurants". Depending on how the term is used in the text, may want to add it as a type.
219	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 6 – 25.06.04 d. 2. (f) p. 7:Add (f) Create any additional pollution, waste stream or environmental nuisance.
220	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 7 – 25.07.01 e. p. 1: Add e. Create additional pollutant loads, waste streams or environmental nuisance.
221	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 7 – 25.07.01 b. 2. p. 2: Add something similar to "Create additional pollutant loads, waste streams or environmental nuisance."
222	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 7 – 25.07.01 c. 2. (b) p. 3: Add something similar to "Create additional pollutant loads, waste streams or environmental nuisance."
223	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 9 – Title p. 1: replace "Hobe" with "Home"

	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
224	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 9 – 25.09.05 a. 1 p. 3:replace "not" with "no" more than five (5) feet....
225	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 9 – 25.09.07 2. p. 8: Noise should cross reference the County noise ordinance
226	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 9 – 25.09.07 b. 10 (C) p. 10:Check grammar for (c) Equipment or facilities....
227	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 10 – 25.10.01 b. p. 1:Similarly to 25.01, not sure what "adequate light, air" means. What is adequate and how are these regulations requiring that?
228	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 10 – 25.10.05 b. 2 p. 6:What is R-S? Be consistent with zone names.
229	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 10 – 25.10.05 d. p. 6: We want even less impervious surface on commercial buildings (through the use of roof gardens and pervious pavement, etc). Revise or clarify the intent of this entry.
230	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 11 – 25.11.03 p. 1: Title bar has "residential" spelled incorrectly in the 3rd Zones Column
231	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 11 – 25.11.10 a. p. 6: This provision for private vehicular way seems excessive. At the very least there should be categories for size requirements depending on type of access, other points of access available, etc.
232	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 11 – 25.11.10 a. p. 6:Add stormwater management to this list.
233	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 11 – 25.11.10 a. p. 6: Strike the word pavement from the last sentence.
234	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 11 – 25.11.10 d. p. 6: Strike the 150 feet requirement. We need to promote use of garages or shared parking. 150 ft. not likely enough.
235	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 11 – 25.11.10 e. p. 6:Add swales it islands
236	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5:Change Housing for Senior Adults in Light Industrial zones from N to P
237	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5: Change Libarieis , museums and art galleries in Commercial and Light industrial zones to permitted
238	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5: Change hospitals in Commercial and Light Industrial zones to permitted
239	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5:Change Alcoholic berages for consumption off the premises in Light Industrial zones from N to P
240	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5: Change Automobile repail in light industrial zones to P
241	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5: Change Consumable goods in LI zones to P
242	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5: Change Durable goods in LI zones to P
243	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5: Change Garden Supplies in LI zones to P
244	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5: Fill in Home Maintenances for Heavy Industrial zones (currently blank)
245	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5: Fix extra row in F. Commerical, office & industrial uses
246	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5: Change Office Business in LI zones to P
247	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5: Change Personal Care Facility in LI zones to P

	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
248	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5: Change Pet Grooming in LI zones to P
249	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5: Change restaurant in LI zones to P
250	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5: Change Banks and ....w/no drive through in LI zones to P
251	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5: Change Banks and ....w/drive through in LI zones to P
252	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5: Change Medical Profession in LI Zones to P
253	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5: Change Automobile rental in LI zones to P
254	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5: · Overall comment – The uses in the zone appear to be completely arbitrary. You might want to think of a more systematic way of deciding uses because this is 1) a little confusing, 2) has a lot of holes (if you do not specifically mention a use is it automatically excluded even though the use is consistent with the zone), and 3) will be hard to defend later if challenged.
255	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5: · f. 2. This is inconsistent with the “alcoholic beverages at restaurant” on the previous page.
256	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 12 – 25.12.04 Table p. 6: To the extent possible, you should try to make these tables consistent through the document. They should have the same columns and rows, same heading format, etc. For example, sometimes the % is in the heading and sometimes the % is attached to the entry.
257	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 12 – 25.12.04 Table p. 6: Re: the blank left in lot converge, should it be 90% since there is a 10% green area requirement.
258	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 12 – 25.12.04 d. 1. (b) p. 7: replace "exceed" with "exceeding"
259	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 12 – 25.12.04 d. 1. (c) p. 7: Clarify – in the low-density residential zone (r-150), building height is 40 feet. Which residential zone(s) are you talking about here? Don't be too restrictive – structured parking is our friend.
260	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 12 – 25.12.04 2. table p. 8: Clarify with exact zone(s) and add figure number.
261	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 13 – 25.13.01 a.(3) 3. p. 1: after "built environment" add"and provide for stormwater management;"
262	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 13 – 25.13.01 a. 8. p. 1: Reword. Confusing.
263	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 13 – 25.13.02 table p. 2-3: Reformat this table. Add spacing in between words, fix inconsistent use of bold, etc.
264	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 13 – 25.13.02 table p. 2-3: It looks like the vast majority of mixed-use is located along Rockville Pike – so perhaps “highway corridors” is misleading. Perhaps call this “Transit District” and call the existing “Transit District” “Metro District”.
265	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 13 – 25.13. 03 table p. 3-10:Fix lines for last Column
266	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 13 – 25.13.06 a. 2. p. 14: Cite the document.
267	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 13 – 25.13.06 a. 4. p. 15: Remove paragraph that begins “Construction materials such as tilt-up screens”
268	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 13 – 25.13.06 b. 5. p. 16-17: What is “street furniture” it is not in the definition.
269	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 13 – 25.13.08 c. p. 25: Be more specific about what constitutes “green area” – it is not in the definition section.
270	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 14 – 25.14.06 table p. 8: Change name of zone to Park.

	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
271	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 14 – 25.14.07 b p. 10: There are several PDs on the zoning map not on this list: PD-FP, PD-DB for example.
272	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 15 – 25.15.01 a. 1. (b) (iii) p. 1: Storm drainage change to stormwater management.
273	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 15: Page numbering is centered. Fix to right corner
274	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 15 –p. 10: Add a space between (d) and "e. Charitable and.."
275	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 15 – 25.15.02 j. second 3. p. 15: Fix numbering and If typo. Consider rewriting labeled sentence.
276	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 16 – 25.16.03 table p. 3 - 9: Overall comment – Why is this organized by use? It seems overly complicated and it will be easy for potentially uses to fall through the cracks. Why not organize this by size of structure, number of people it services, location, etc.
277	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 16 – 25.16.06 d. p. 16:Can we suggest some other permeable surfaces here" why list any if you aren't giong to list al or are these the only surface options
278	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 16 –p. 18: Add Space between 3. and "General Requirements"
279	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 16 – 25.16.09 c. 2. (b) (iv) p. 22: The long term biking requirement is very confusing. You should consider rewording. See book for exact comment.
280	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 18 –p. 5: Add a space between 6. and 7.
281	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 21 – 25.21.13 b. 4. (d)p. 9: replace "working the neighborhood" with "working in the neighborhood"
282	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 21 – 25.21.14 a. 3. p. 11: This is unclear. Not sure what you mean here. Consider revising.
283	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Landscaping and lighting Manual Section 1 p.1: Purpose statement- change "Article" to "Manual"
284	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Landscaping and lighting Manual Section 1 p.1: add space between "intended to" and "require the landscaping"
285	Christina Ginsberg	Editing/Organiz ation	Can we amend the sign provisions to allow 5 signs on a residential property since we have 5 elected positions? Currently we allow 4 signs.
286	David Celeste	Editing/Organiz ation	Can we amend the sign provisions to allow 5 signs on a residential property since we have 5 elected positions? Currently we allow 4 signs.
287	HDC	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 3: As the definition for Demolition by Neglect is different from the State definition in 66B, which governs? We should be consistent with our terminology. [Com. van Balgooy] Staff noted that the City may be more stringent than the State. This provides for general protection of a building's integrity and character; the HDC could be involved in the "cure" if the owner wanted to make changes to address the deterioration of features brought on through demolition by neglect.
288	Erika Kapneck	Editing/Organiz ation	25.09.07 p 11 HBBE (5)(c) is confusing because it singles out professions where minor HBBE does not. It seems as though certain professions are automatically considered "major". This was not the intent of the ordinance and should be revised so it does not imply so.
289	JWH Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 13 p 13 (d) is unclear. Consider revising
290	HP Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 1- Add historic resources and how they enhance the visual, aesthetic qualities of life as well as promotes environmental sustainability
291	HP Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 3- Why are servants excluded from "family" definition?
292	HP Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Bed & Breakfast def- Check with Article 66B for # of guests allowed. Are we in conflict of those standards?
293	HP Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Building Height- 3. Unclear about exception,

	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
294	HP Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Gross Floor Area- what constitutes tenant use. Does an attic count?
295	HP Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Should there be a definition for an abandoned building?
296	HP Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Definition needed for Archaeological sites
297	HP Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Definition needed for Historic site, resources, etc
298	HP Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Add definitions for right of way, unimproved right of way, and how alleys are different
299	HP Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 10- p 6 says his dis are exempt from rear lot coereage. Are they also exempt from total lot coverage? (HP staff suggest to include total lot coverage)
300	The JBG Companies	Editing/Organizat ion	RORZOR Provision: 25.13.05.b.1: The term “None” does not distinguish between “None Required” where a setback could be provided if desired versus “None Permitted” where all development must be built at the property line. <b><u>See JBG comments submitted 12.14.07</u></b>
301	The JBG Companies	Editing/Organizat ion	It is unclear how the term “street line” is defined as it does not distinguish between the property line (aka edge of right-of-way) and the building line as defined by the required sidewalk depth within Section 25.17.05.b.2. <b><u>See JBG comments submitted 12.14.07</u></b>
302	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 17 – 25.17.01 a p. 1: Delete “/” after “parks/ and other spaces...”
303	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 17 – 25.17.01 c p. 1: Insert “Public” into title – Fee in lieu of public use space requirements.
304	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 17 – 25.17.02 a p. 1: Change “This manual will provide information...” to “This manual provides information...” – no need to use future tense.
305	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 17 – 25.17.05 b. table p. 5: Need to define “Clear Path” and “Amenity/Safety Area” – what is appropriate for each area??
306	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 17 – 25.17.05 b. table p. 5: Which zones exactly does this table pertain to? It says “For Areas Other than Single Unit Detached Residential” – does that mean all R-### zones? What about RMD zones? That means that these numbers pertain to Park zones?
307	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 17 – 25.17 p. 7: Is this page supposed to be here? Delete page.
308	Env. Staff	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 21 – 25.21.20 a. p. 16: Spelling error “esthetics” should be “aesthetics” (ok, “esthetics” is technically correct too, but the “real” spelling is “aesthetics”).
309	JBG-DMSAS	Editing/Organiz ation	25.13.05 – Dimensional Development Standards: The term “None” does not distinguish between “None Required” where a setback could be provided if desired versus “None Permitted” where all development must be built at the property line.
310	JBG-DMSAS	Editing/Organiz ation	It is unclear how the term “street line” is defined as it does not distinguish between the property line (aka edge of right-of-way) and the building line as defined by the required sidewalk depth within Section 25.17.05.b.2.
311	Environment Commission	Editing/Organiz ation	See Coments for Typing Errors
312	Environment Commission	Editing/Organiz ation	25.12.04 – Table mentions “green area” – is this defined?
313	Environment Commission	Editing/Organiz ation	p. 2, 4 (b) - suggest replacing “constraints” with “requirements”, so that environment is associated with a positive word rather than a negative one.
314	Environment Commission	Editing/Organiz ation	p. 19: suggest larger fonts on the drawings. (Parking)
315	Environment Commission	Editing/Organiz ation	Land Man. · p. 1: add a space between “to” and “require” at “Additionally, this manual is intended torequire the landscaping . . .”
316	Environment Commission	Editing/Organiz ation	Land Man · p. 8, low wattage incandescent light: spelling on “non-halogen”



	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
317	Environment Commission	Editing/Organiz ation	Land Man · p. 16 (iii) (A): spelling of “area” in first line
318	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	See Mark P's Comments for Chart of Words that need to be defined
319	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Need comparative table of living arrangements.
320	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Need graphic description of kinds of lines with illustrations.
321	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Need list of City of Rockville Plans, Policies, and Guidelines (e.g., 17-6 environmental guidelines).
322	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Need table of manuals and where they can be procured or seen.
323	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Need table of all Special Methods and Plans, even if they are no longer allowed.
324	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Need table of kinds of trees.
325	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Need list of all kinds of master plans including for example, bicycle master plan and street tree master plan. This should include planning areas, and a map of planning areas.
326	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Need separate table of kinds of streets, with illustrations.
327	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Need separate table of kinds of development
328	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Need table of kinds of roofs with illustrations
329	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Need flow chart of approval paths
330	Environment Commission	Editing/Organiz ation	Art 17 p. 3 (3): suggest deleting “on” with “or”
331	Environment Commission	Editing/Organiz ation	Art 18 · p. 14 (ii): suggest adding, at end of paragraph “up to a maximum of _____ linear feet”
332	Environment Commission	Editing/Organiz ation	Art 18 p. 15, pictures at top: what does the symbol mean – the circle with the diagonal line through it? Also, the pictures are unclear – perhaps notes would help. Is the space below the freestanding sign the landscaped area? Can you have both a freestanding sign as well as a wall –mounted, or is it one or the other? Can the wall mounted be anywhere, centered or at the corner?
333	Environment Commission	Editing/Organiz ation	Art 18 p. 16, picture at bottom: suggest that the notes get angled to match the rest of the drawing; or maybe a better idea is to keep them as is, but pull them outside of the graphic entirely.
334	Environment Commission	Editing/Organiz ation	Art 18 p. 17, (2) (a): change “fro” to “for”
335	Environment Commission	Editing/Organiz ation	Art 18 · p17 (2) (b) (v) (B): change “heights” to “height”
336	Environment Commission	Editing/Organiz ation	Art 18 · p. 17 (2) (b) (v) (D): change “hand” to “and”
337	Environment Commission	Editing/Organiz ation	Art 18 · p. 23, top paragraph: at the end of “50 linear feet” add “to a maximum of _____ linear feet”
338	Environment Commission	Editing/Organiz ation	Art 18 · p. 27, (E): native plants at all landscaped areas
339	Environment Commission	Editing/Organiz ation	Art 18 Where is section 25.18.17?
340	Environment Commission	Editing/Organiz ation	Art 19 · 25.19.10 The title reads “Remedies Cumulative, not Inclusive”, while the body specifically describes remedies as “not alternative” and “not exclusive”. Does the heading need revision?

	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
341	Environment Commission	Editing/Organiz ation	Art 21 · 25.21.10-b(1) I believe the PC may mean “datum”, as opposed to “data”.
342	Holland & Knight	Editing/Organiz ation	Trash collection areas - many building designs do not include selfcontained collection areas. Requirement as drafted requires multi-family residential projects' collections to occur 50' from subject building. Doubt that this was the intent.
343	Holland & Knight	Editing/Organiz ation	MXE Ground floor - this subsection is unnecessary given use table.
344	Holland & Knight	Editing/Organiz ation	MXE What is objective? (c) Typo: Eliminate "or" in first line.
345	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	In general the draft text is readable and understandable in a line-by-line reading. However, it is a very large and technically complex document and it is hard to grasp the breadth and depth of what is being proposed.
346	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	The section on definitions needs to be expanded by about 80 definitions. These are words and phrases found in the rest of the draft text. See appendix A. Better explanations and overviews are needed of key concepts. These are enumerated in Appendix B.
347	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Mixed-use zones are defined in terms of what is allowed, but there is no requirement that all uses be developed. For example, a mixed-use zone of residential, commercial, and office may end up being residential and commercial only, or just residential. It thus appears that there is a certain risk to surrounding communities if an area is zoned mixed use because the zone could end up being anything.
348	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	The definition of family is problematic.
349	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Page 8-2: 25.08.02 c 3. How about not started?
350	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Page 8-7: 25.08.06 d. When should 1 be followed and when should 2 be followed?
351	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Page 9-8: 25.09.07 a 2 (a). Computers, radios, and many other devices would fall within this restriction. You need to state strength of signal. Any electrical field is detectable these days.
352	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Page 9-13: 25.09.08 2 (c) How can you use a future technology?
353	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Page 10-4: Row g of the table. What does <i>accessories</i> mean in this context?
354	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Page 10-6: 25.10.05 d. Why do we have this exclusion?
355	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Page 11-1: 25.11.03 d. What is the difference between Special Exception and Conditional Use?
356	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Page 12-7: 25.12.04, b 1. “unless otherwise specified” What does this mean?
357	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Page 13-1: 25.13.01 a 5. What does this sentence mean?
358	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	1Page 13-1: 25.13.01 a 7. “existing nearby buildings and” should be “existing nearby buildings an neighborhoods”.
359	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Page 13-15: 25.13.06 a 5. This sentence can be read either way.
360	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Page 14-2: 25.14.01 d 1 (a) (v) “any other person”. Why is this here?
361	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Page 14-2: 25.14.01 e 2 (c). Too broad.
362	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Page 14-9: 25.14.07 Planned Development Zones. Need definition.
363	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Page 14-12: 25.14.07 d 5 (b). Reference to “d.5 below” doesn't go anywhere.

	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
364	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Page 16-12: The table. What do the percents mean?
365	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Page 16-13: (e) towards the top of the page. The first sentence is not a sentence.
366	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Page 16-13: 25.16.05 The sentence starting with "An automobile parking structure . . ." seems to be a misplaced sentence.
367	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Page 17-4: 25.17.04 b. There should be a number 8 for light shades.
368	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Page 17-5: The table. Having trouble understanding what the numbers are all about. Are these sidewalk widths or setbacks from the road?
369	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 18: Like the fact that there are diagrams, but put them in one place. It is hard to know why the diagrams are located where they are in the text. It is very hard to understand the diagrams. Some diagrams are redundant.
370	Citizen	Editing/Organiz ation	Article 18: A lot of the information appearing in outline form is better presented in tabular form as is done for the zoning definition, especially for mixed-use zones.
371	Env. Staff	Environment	We should build: Energy-efficiency; Support the City's Green Building Program; and Walkable neighborhoods into this section (Article 1 Purpose section p1)
372	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 3 – building, height of a p. 7: Any special height points if building has a green or living roof?
373	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 3 Floodplain p14 - "As defined or delineated on the latest FEMA flood maps."
374	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 3 – Landscaping p. 18: Add rain gardens, rain barrels and stormwater management features, including swales.
375	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 3 – Lot, buildable p. 19: "After subtracting any applicable water quality buffer from the parcel."
376	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 3 – Public utility building p. 25: How would a "windmill" (for electricity) or solar energy collector fit here? Include concepts in definition.
377	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 3 – Suggested addition: Add definition for solar collector and windmill since we will need to add them as exemptions to our height restrictions later.
378	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 3 – 25.03.03 usable area p. 37: Vegetated water quality buffers are not part of the "useable area."
379	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 9 – 25.09.05 p. 4: Is a rain barrel or cistern (i.e. big rain barrel) considered a structure? How do we exempt them?
380	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 9 – 25.09.08 p. 12: Need to add an additional section similar to 25.09.08 for wind turbines. While this document should not be the forum for promoting wind turbines, it needs to acknowledge them so that it does not become a barrier later.
381	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 10 – 25.10.05 table of dimensional standards p. 5: Can we encourage the use of gravel or pervious pavements here?
382	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 13 – 25.13.06 b. 4. p. 16: Trash, recycling, and waste oil/grease should all be included here. You may also want to mention that all must be properly/securely covered.
383	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 13 – 25.13.06 b. 5. p. 16-17: Add trees, landscaping and green walls to the parking structure facades.
384	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 14 – 25.14.07 d. 7. p. 13: Can we have a line about environmental benefits and constraints?
385	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 15 – 25.15.02 k. 2. p. 16: Add (d) Provide appropriate stormwater management and waste isolation facilities.
386	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 15 – 25.15.02 m. p. 16: Add, "Use only phosphate-free soaps and treatments, and must discharge treated wash water to sanitary sewers only."
387	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 16 – 25.16.01 Purpose p. 1: Add – Minimize stormwater runoff from parking lots and structures
388	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 16 – 25.16.03 table p. 3 - 9: Overall comment – Where did the numbers for parking come from. EMD would like to discuss this section with you; especially the bike parking numbers (they all need to be increased).
389	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 16 – 25.16.06 d. p. 16: Include approved permeable surface construction type in this list or include a standard in this zoning ordinance.
390	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 16 – 25.16.06 d. p. 16: Remove all bullets under d
391	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 16 – 25.16.07 a. p. 17: If paking is above ground, should be designed to support a green roof.
392	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 17 – 25.17.07 p. 6: Add streamside buffers from the Water Quality Protection Ordinance.
393	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 21 – 25.21.21 b. p. 16: No recreation at the expense of conservation and water quality management.
394	Env. Staff	Environment	Landscaping and lighting: Over all comment – Landscaping is extremely important in stormwater management and water quality programs. We are concerned that, by putting the landscaping section into the manual instead of the ordinance, we will be less protective of the requirements outlined here. It will be easy to make them less protective in the future than if they were housed in the ordinance.
395	Env. Staff	Environment	Landscaping and lighting Section 4, b. 4. (l) p.2: Add (l) – Landscaping plan should integrate stormwater management controls and treatment.
396	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 17 – 25.17.02 d. p. 2: We should exempt requirements to screen rain barrels, cisterns, solar panels, wind turbines, etc.
397	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 17 – 25.17.05 b. table p. 5: Environmental Management would like to discuss rationale for all sidewalk widths.

	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
398	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 17 – 25.17.06 p. 5: Consider shadow casting in residential areas too – think in terms of “solar rights” of a home to receive sunlight on its roof in case the owner wished to put solar arrays / PVs on the roof. Neighboring homes should not be allowed to be built which would cast a shadow over the roof for significant amounts of the day. This would be a slightly anti-McMansion regulation as well.
399	Env. Staff	Environment	Article 21 – 25.21.16 b. 8. p. 14: · Is a 110-foot diameter the minimum required turning radius for safety vehicles (fire and ambulance)? That should be our minimum – not needed to create more impervious surface than necessary.
400	Env. Staff	Environment	Landscaping and lighting Section 4, d. 2 (a) p. 3: · “... This area must be planted with either shade or ornamental trees, depending on the site conditions and the Street Tree Master Plan” – we should include a caveat here that would allow for this area to be used for LID/bioretention measures (with underdrain) if that is more applicable, and planted with appropriate wetlands species rather than trees in that case.
401	Env. Staff	Environment	Landscaping and lighting Section 4, d. 2 (c) p. 4: · Or can we specify the percent canopy coverage required of the entire lot? I.e., 50% of the paved surface must be covered by tree canopy at full grow-out? Something like that.
402	Environment Commission	Environment	We would also like to point out the need to reconcile recommendations here on green and open spaces with the open space plan being undertaken by Public Works Department. The Environment Commission would like to see open and green space increase and be better protected within the City. In fact setting a future target such as XX percent of the City's land become green or open space by 20XX would be preferred. Under such a scenario, developers and the city would not simply be able to exchange funds to reduce open/green space requirements for a development, but would also have to find a solution to meet the plan's growth or if already met to sustain existing levels through allocation elsewhere in the city. Any funds exchanged should go to the purchase or maintenance of open/green space. For the future of our environment, we should not be willing sell for short-term gain (budget or otherwise) lands that help carbon sequestration (i.e., keep our air clean), balance our ecosystem, support storm water management and provide other amenities to the city's residents.
403	Environment Commission	Environment	We would like greater scrutiny of the recommendations and their impact on the deployment of environmental technologies. The deployment of these technologies should not be by exception. Instead the rules set forth here should encourage their deployment as first choice (deviation from environmental technologies should be made the exception in many cases), but as you will see as you read through the comments of the Commissioners the rules as currently depicted would inhibit their deployment. We would suggest in the annotated manual that adjoins this ordinance that this principle be one of the “first principles or vision” cited as an objective of the ordinance)
404	Environment Commission	Environment	p. 3 in the parking chart: suggest not using 1.5 spaces required; change to 2 instead.
405	Environment Commission	Environment	Art 17 · p. 2 (2): encourage or require native plants
406	Environment Commission	Environment	Art 17 · p. 3. 25.17.05 - Lighting (a) Purpose: 1. Protect the ecosystem, bird migrations; light pollution reduction.
407	Environment Commission	Environment	Art 17 · p. 4, 25.17.05, Sidewalks, Purpose: 1. help the environment/ecosystem, watershed by using pervious paving
408	Environment Commission	Environment	Art 17 · p. 5, chart: buffer/tree lawn: specify: lawn or trees or what? If not specified, we'll get the minimum. What is “amenity/safety area”?
409	Environment Commission	Environment	Art 117 · p. 5, (b): suggest changing “ at least 2 hours” to “at least 4 hours”
410	Environment Commission	Environment	Art 17 · Section 25.17.2 - Page 2 - # 2 – The landscaping manual provides very little information about an “approved plant list” other than the approving authority must approve the list submitted. There should be language requiring that where a native species of plant will meet the desired function or need, then the native species should be used over other non-native species. This is obviously not going to be possible for every application but the use of native plants should be more strongly encouraged or promoted if not required.
411	Environment Commission	Environment	Art 17 · For those properties that abut a stream, there should be a requirement that a mandatory stream buffer is maintained.
412	Environment Commission	Environment	Art 17 · No mention of energy efficient lighting options such as LED or compact fluorescent. Perhaps these lighting methods will not provide the service required in all situations but I think it is worth considering them for some applications.
413	Environment Commission	Environment	Art 18 Section 25.18.04 - I was pleased to see that signs including balloons or other materials that often contribute to excess litter were not allowed. Does this include the use of balloons on a home's “For Sale” sign highlighting an open house or something? I am hoping this section prohibits the use of balloons, steamers etc as a means of attracting attention to a sign.
414	Environment Commission	Environment	Art 18 Section 25.18.06 – Illumination – it would be nice to mandate that permanent, free-standing signs requiring power are outfitted with a means of generating power for the lights such as solar panels.
415	Environment Commission	Environment	Art 18 Section 25.18.11 (d)(4) – Does this section prohibit the posting of temporary signs advertising yard sales or other personal, non-commercial events on things like telephone poles? Perhaps this issues is addressed in Section 25.18.16 (c)?
416	Environment Commission	Environment	Art 21 · 25.21.08 – Submission Requirements for Preliminary Plans: Do we want to constrain all applicants to the use of paper plats/survey/maps?

	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
417	Environment Commission	Environment	Art 21 · 25.21.08-b(5) What constitutes a wooded area? Is there a minimum size or density? This term also appears in a couple of the general definitions, but is never itself enumerated.
418	Environment Commission	Environment	Art 21 · 25.21.08-10 USDA produces a number of soil map products. The PC should specify the product or the geographical data that they're after.
419	Environment Commission	Environment	Land Man. · p. 4, top paragraph and also (b): suggest landscaping is encourage more than walls or fences – better for the watershed and imperviousness.
420	Environment Commission	Environment	Land Man · p. 5 (c) suggest encouraging landscaping over walls
421	Environment Commission	Environment	Land Man · p. 6 (4) (a): encourage landscaping over fences
422	Environment Commission	Environment	Land Man · p. 7, Section 5, Lighting Standards, Purpose: to reduce light pollution, help with bird migration
423	Environment Commission	Environment	Land Man· p. 7 (b), efficacy: "expressed as lumens per watt"
424	Environment Commission	Environment	Land Man · p. 8 (d) (1): "light may be directed towards the sky" - no.
425	Citizen	Environment	Page 13-18: 25.13.b 8 (a). Trees or shrubs do not provide noise protection.
426	IPI/Cong	Nonconformities	Nonconformities. The code does not have any grandfathering provisions. And section 25.08.05 is extraordinarily restrictive. For example, if an operating business that is non conforming due to development standards experienced a fire to over 50% of the property, the owner could not replace the existing facility. The business would be shut down. Has the City considered the serious implications of this language? This could have far reaching negative impacts on the business owners, employees and property owners. Certainly this is not the City's intention. In addition, it appears from the language that we would be unable to complete certain renovations such as adding another showroom to the property. And if we were allowed to do so, would we have to comply with the new code and build a 35' high showroom. This alone would require a redevelopment of a good portion of the site. These sorts of requirements will have a serious impact on how well local businesses will be able to respond to market conditions and therefore on their survival.
427	Holland & Knight	Nonconformities	Section 25. 08.04 a.2. - Nonconforming Uses This nonconforming provision is based on the County provision which lacks clarity and is in need of revision. The provision confuses nonconforming uses and nonconforming structures. We would recommend that this provision be reevaluated.
428	Shulmn, Rogers, Gandal, Pordy & Ecker P.A.	Nonconformities	I respectfully recommend that preexisting uses, buildings, and site improvements should be declared as conforming
429	Shulmn, Rogers, Gandal, Pordy & Ecker P.A.	Nonconformities	Should the city wish to encourage new development to occur under new zones, the provision of incentives to do so woul be far more effective than imposing penalties for failure to redevelop
430	Shulmn, Rogers, Gandal, Pordy & Ecker P.A.	Nonconformities	I recommend that the following lanaguage be added to the Ordinance in Section 25.01.09 : All uses, buildings and site improvements legally exisiting as of [insert date of adoption of new Zoning Ordinance or approval of SMA] are hereby deemed conforming. They bay be continued, maintained, repaired, modified, and/or rebuilt in part o in whole in accordance with the standards and uses of their zoning designation immediately prior to [insert date]. Any expansion itself must comply with the applicable height, setback and lot coverage requirements of the then current zoning category of the property
431	Staff	Nonconformity	Need some kind of amortization or grandfather provision for buildings that will otherwise become nonconforming – adverse impact on financing, insurance, etc.
432	Ray Whalen	Nonconformity	Why bother with Nonconformities? Why not grandfather everything that would be a nonconformity?
433	Land Use Attorneys	Nonconformity	How to answer lenders questions- refinancing of building burns down beyond 50% to allow rebuilding of what's there.
434	Staff	Nonconformity	25.09.05b: add provision for unimproved rights of way, if added late; improved buildings and accessory structures may continue, add development standards . Could add nonconformity language to Article 8
435	Citizen	Nonconformity	When are buildings required to conform to the new standards?



G			
	A	B	
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
436	HDC	Other	" Also, recommend section regarding the Chief of Planning making decisions concerning eligibility be struck 25.14.01 Historic District Zones [Com. van Balgooy]
437	HDC	Other	There are several parks with HD properties. [Com. van Balgooy] Staff notes update of Park & Recreation Open Space Plan, where HP needs to be involved.
438	Sally Ann Stinner	Outside Ordinance	"How will the City enforce development standards against the City owned and developed sites?"
439	Rockshire HOA	Outside Ordinance	Rockshire needs architectural guidelines for their plan review
440	Environment Commission	Outside Ordinance	Upload an interactive Zoning Map onto the website so that zones can be turned on and off
441	Robin Ziek	Outside Ordinance	25.04.04(b)(1) after (c) before (d): d)Work to safeguard the heritage of the city by preserving sites, structures, and districts that reflect elements of the city's cultural, social economic, political, archaeological or architectural history; e) promote the preservation and appreciation of the City's historic resources for the education and welfare of the residents; and, f) And other powers vested
442	Citizen	Outside Ordinance	M&C should tell HDC to allow upgrades and modernization
443	Citizen	Outside Ordinance	Consider soliciting comments from adolescents and young adults as they are the future stakeholders in the City
444	Citizen	Outside Ordinance	Can we get sprinklers in our building
445	Staff	Outside Ordinance	Staff needs to maintain a map of approved site plans
446	Env. Staff	Outside Ordinance	Article 15 – 25.15.02 v. 2. (b) p. 18: What is the membership of the Rockville swim center?
447	Env. Staff	Outside Ordinance	Landscaping and lighting Section 4, d. 2 (e) p. 4: May want to consider adding an extensive list of preferred plant types to help encourage native planting. This would be really, really good.
448	HDC	Outside Ordinance	Article 1: Add note that, as City is built-out, the Purpose of the Code needs to reference history resources as well as natural resources, and protection of historic resources. This also reflects the idea that Rockville is distinctive, and different from other cities. How is this? One way is through its history, as illustrated with its historic resources. [Com. van Balgooy] Add in goal of Sustainable Development; and review draft zoning ordinance to assure that it does not hinder sustainability. In the same way that lighting standards is addressed very specifically, perhaps other items should also be included, such as energy standards, siting for solar gain, green building standards. This should be a broad policy statement, may go into the building code, but it all starts at the Site Plan level, and so should go into the Zoning Ordinance. [Com. Moloney]
449	HDC	Outside Ordinance	Article 4: Include the review of properties 50 years or older or possessing historic significance in the Zoning Ordinance? When does the HDC look at proposed demolitions? [Com. Moloney]
450	HDC	Outside Ordinance	Also, language about HDC approvals (Art 4, Page 10) is stilted and needs to be revised. [Com. van Balgooy]
451	HDC	Outside Ordinance	Article 14: Purpose section should be broadened to entire City, to reflect the broad beneficial effects of historic preservation beyond the specific sites.
452	HDC	Outside Ordinance	add sustainability as a purpose, to encourage reuse of properties. Also add to Chapter 1: purpose/goals, how HP helps with all the goals.
453	HDC	Outside Ordinance	Regarding Article 14/page 2: remove the 50 years parameter and add ...[some appropriate language].
454	Env. Staff	Outside Ordinance	Finally, should we add something about "Period of Significance?"
455	Traffic & Transportation Commission	Outside Ordinance	Article 17 – 25.17.03 p. 2: What about the noise from this equipment? Some make a high-pitched whining noise, which can be really irritating – probably want requirements for noise.
456	IPI/Cong	Outside Ordinance	Rockville's most serious T&T concerns seem to focus on streets that are also state or county highways -- Rockville Pike, Rt. 28, Viers Mill Rd. The City has relied on the good will of other governments to deal with Rockville issues on these streets. Recognition of joint responsibility could strengthen our hand in dealing with the county and state. How does the ZO handle such situations?
			This zoning code attempts to what most zoning codes do not do and that is to design in three dimensions. Advice should be obtained from trained professionals (ie. architects and engineers) experienced in the actual implementation of three dimensional designs and who are conversant in a multitude of building forms. Actual sample schematics on different property types should be completed. Trying to impose the same three dimensional parameters on small sites and large sites alike will most likely create unintended and poor results. The master plan and zoning process is so vitally important to the future of Rockville that it is essential that it be demonstrated in advance that the code will actually encourage the desired results.

	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
457	IPI/Cong	Outside Ordinance	Would suggest that the City consult with the master plan team on the appropriate scale of the buildings to complement the ultimate right of way width of Rockville Pike. It may be determined that the correct proportion is a six story building or greater.
458	Environment Commission	Outside Ordinance	Art 17 · p. 6: where are the environmental guidelines?
459	Environment Commission	Outside Ordinance	Art 17 · Page 1, C(1b) – If the City is going to accept a fee from a developer in lieu of that developer including open space into the plan, the City should maintain that money in fund devoted to improving other areas of open space. The way this section is currently worded, it seems that the City is given the freedom to do what they want with the fee money.
460	Environment Commission	Outside Ordinance	Art 19 · 25.19.04.c(4) and 25.19.06-b(3) Notices are required to designate a City department to contact. A person (position) is preferable to facilitate communication and to expedite resolution of the violation.
461	Citizen	Outside Ordinance	It is very difficult to compare the draft RORZOR text to the existing Chapter 25 (Zoning and Planning) of the City's Code. It is possible to go online and view the City's Charter and Code at <a href="http://www.Municode.com">www.Municode.com</a> but the online view allows you to view only a small section of the ordinance at one time. I cannot print the use tables and I cannot get a good overview of the existing code. This limits my review of the RORZOR draft.
462	Citizen	Outside Ordinance	For any named mixed-used area, such as the Woodley Gardens Plaza, it is not clear how strictures such as the height and setback requirements limit the true realizable height.
463	Citizen	Outside Ordinance	The College Gardens Plaza will be up for redevelopment in the next 5 to 10 years.
464	Citizen	Outside Ordinance	The College Gardens community, as represented by the College Gardens Civic Association, would like better flexibility to negotiate with the property owner at the time of submission as to the actual uses allowed, including requiring the owner to develop to all permissible uses in a zone.
465	Citizen	Outside Ordinance	Page 9-4: 25.09.05 a 8. What if the Right Of Way improvements subsequently come into CIP?
466	Citizen	Outside Ordinance	Page 14-2: 25.14.01 d 1 (c). The 50-year rule should be tossed.
467	Citizen	Outside Ordinance	Page 19-1: 25.19.03. How about serial violations? How should these be defined and discouraged?
468	Staff	Parking	Page 5, Furniture Store - unit measure should be "square feet of net building area accessible to the public"
469	Staff	Parking	Page 5, Bowling Alley - additional requirements should read "Bicycle parking may also be determined by staff review"
470	Staff	Parking	Page 7 ,Retail, Sales, Trade or Merchandizing (except furniture stores and supermarkets less than 30,000 SF of GFA) - short term: 2 per 5,000 SF; long term: 2 per 12,000 SF
471	Staff	Parking	Page 22, 2.iii, replace "300 feet of the site" with "300 feet of the entrance"
472	Staff	Parking	Page 22, 2. iv, add "W" on first word
473	Staff	Parking	Page 22, 2 v, change last sentence so that it reads "The lockers must be installed adjacent to the showers in a safe and secured area and be accessible to all tenants of the building."
474	Staff	Parking	Page 23, 3 b, add the following sentence to the end of the paragraph. "The Department of Public Works maintains a handbook of lockers and site location guidelines for lockers"
475	Rockville Bicycle Advisory Committee	Parking	Should all bicycle parking be covered? Generally no
476		Parking	Convert automobile parking to bike parking if demand changes
477	Env. Staff	Parking	Article 3 – 25.03.03 Parking spaces p. 38: We do not want to require minimum parking spaces, particularly if near a metro or bus stop. Or if off set by bike lockers or racks, or near shared parking with another parcel.
478	Env. Staff	Parking	Article 3 – 25.03.03 Parking spaces p. 38: We also want to allow rain gardens and stormwater swales in the parking lot, and the use of pervious services for all part of the lot.
479	Env. Staff	Parking	Article 16 – 25.16.03 e. 1. p. 10: This seems excessive. Again, we recommend enforcing maximums not minimums. For example, what is the likelihood that you would need the max. capacity at any given time? This could have spaces for all of main use and some fraction of the second use.
480	Env. Staff	Parking	Article 16 – 25.16.03 e. p. 10: We need better shared parking – should not require permanent designation. Also, especially for churches near other parking lots (like schools) where use does not overlap. Minimize parking be encouraging sharing.
481	Env. Staff	Parking	Article 16 – 25.16.03 f. 1. p. 11: Why 20%? Why not 25%, 30%, 33%? How and why did we decide on this number? If it is already going to Mayor and Council lets not put a limit on it.
482	Env. Staff	Parking	Article 16 – 25.16.03 f. 2. p. 11: This should be as high as the owner wants. Not just 10%.
483	Env. Staff	Parking	Article 16 – 25.16.03 f. 2. Table p. 12: Change Hotel, motel, inn for Weekday daytime 6am-6pm from 70% to 40%
484	Env. Staff	Parking	Article 16 – 25.16.03 f. 2. Table p. 12: Change Hotel, motel, inn for Weekend daytime... from 70% to 35%
485	Env. Staff	Parking	Article 16 – 25.16.04 p. 13: Shared parking should be allowed from separate parking record lots.
486	Env. Staff	Parking	Article 16 – 25.16.06 a. 1. p. 14: Can we minimize width and, therefore impervious surface, by requiring one-way aisles or incentivizing 45 degree angled parking, etc.?

	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
487	Env. Staff	Parking	Article 16 – 25.16.06 b. p. 14: Why are the parking space requirements so big? Can we reduce the size by designating some spots for compact cars only?
488	Env. Staff	Parking	Article 16 – 25.16.06 b. p. 14: Can we provide premium spaces for compact cars, bikes and alternative fuel vehicles?
489	Env. Staff	Parking	Article 16 – 25.16.06 b. 2. p. 15: It should be permitted to allow spaces to be installed in grade of excess of 5% if they drain and swail to the surface lot only
490	Env. Staff	Parking	Article 16 – 25.16.06 b. 3. p. 15: Trying to eliminate curbs to increase LID effectiveness. Want to eliminate curbing unless is it cut curbing,
491	Env. Staff	Parking	Article 16 – 25.16.06 b. 7. p. 15: Can we require that if you need a certain number of parking spaces then you have to provide structured (ideally, underground garage) parking?
492	Env. Staff	Parking	Article 16 – 25.16.06 d. p. 16: We DO NOT want to discourage the use of permeable pavement!
493	Env. Staff	Parking	Article 16 – 25.16.09 c. 1. (C) p. 22: It should not be this easy to get out of the bike parking requirement. Since this should be relatively easy for the developer to comply with, make it harder to get out of.
494	Env. Staff	Parking	Article 16 – 25.16.09 c. 2. (b) (iv) p. 22: You should require a shower for buildings with less than 50,000 GFA. Perhaps with these smaller building it can be a single gender shower like that at city hall. See book for suggested change.
495	Env. Staff	Parking	Article 16 – 25.16.09 c. 2. (b) (vi) p. 22: Aren't bike lockers considered long term? The would not need to be located as described in A-F.
496	The JBG Companies	Parking	RORZOR Provision: 25.13.07.a.6 The intention of not permitting parking in front of buildings is correct in order to avoid the type of development closely associated with suburban strip malls. However, the viability of ground floor retail uses is contingent on the provision of quick, easily accessible on-street parking in front of their location. <u>See JBG comments submitted 12.14.07</u>
497	The JBG Companies	Parking	Within the MXTD zone there exists a wide variety of street types and levels of service that do not currently allow for on-street parking (e.g. the wide, heavily-trafficked Rockville Pike and the narrower Halpine Street). The images and associated diagrams illustrated in our comments are our recommendations for providing additional parking in front of a building while maintaining the sense of a pedestrian-friendly, community street. <u>See JBG comments submitted 12.14.07</u>
498	Staff	Parking	Page 5, Furniture Store - unit measure should be "square feet of net building area accessible to the public"
499	Staff	Parking	Page 5, Bowling Alley - additional requirements should read "Bicycle parking may also be determined by staff review"
500	Staff	Parking	Page 7 ,Retail, Sales, Trade or Merchandizing (except furniture stores and supermarkets less than 30,000 SF of GFA) - short term: 2 per 5,000 SF; long term: 2 per 12,000 SF
501	Staff	Parking	Page 22, 2.iii, replace "300 feet of the site" with "300 feet of the entrance"
502	Staff	Parking	Page 22, 2. iv, add "W" on first word
503	Staff	Parking	Page 22, 2 v, change last sentence so that it reads "The lockers must be installed adjacent to the showers in a safe and secured area and be accessible to all tenants of the building."
504	Staff	Parking	Page 23, 3 b, add the following sentence to the end of the paragraph. "The Department of Public Works maintains a handbook of lockers and site location guidelines for lockers"
505	Traffic & Transportation Commission	Parking	On parking requirements, how do the proposed standards compare to current standards and how do they compare to other nearby jurisdictions' standards? (My impression is that other jurisdictions are getting away from requiring so much on site-parking, in favor of TDM measures.)
506	Traffic & Transportation Commission	Parking	T & T Commission previously requested a change in the parking surface requirement language, to allow the City to require pervious or semi-pervious surfaces rather than impervious surfaces chosen by the developer, if the City felt this was appropriate to the site (less runoff and erosion, less pollution, etc.). Where does this stand?
507	Environment Commission	Parking	p. 3-9, parking chart: required parking seems high, compared to current DC standards which is the code I'm familiar with. Requiring this much parking will cause a lot of impervious area to be created, which is very harmful to the environment, ecosystems, watershed and aquatic life. Unless the idea is to create more underground parking, but that is not stated.
508	Environment Commission	Parking	p. 10, (3), middle of paragraph "If the mix of uses contains one or more restaurants, that, in the aggregate, exceed 4,500 sf . . . . " and continuing to the end of that paragraph. This is unclear. How is the first 4,500 sf calculated? As office space? This doesn't make sense.
509	Environment Commission	Parking	p. 11, (3): the total of every column is at least 100%, so there don't seem to be any reductions for shared uses.
510	Environment Commission	Parking	p. 13 (e): "exists that warrants" - unclear wording. " However, an inability to comply . . . " and continuing to the end of the paragraph: unclear. If you aren't complying with F.C. requirements, then you should be able to get all the parking in.
511	Environment Commission	Parking	p. 14 (4): say what percent is allowed for garage ramps in parking structures. I'm an architect and design these often; it would be difficult to design without knowing the allowed slope on the ramp.
512	Environment Commission	Parking	p. 15 (3) and (4) appear to conflict.
513	Environment Commission	Parking	p. 15 (4) (a): unclear.
514	Environment Commission	Parking	p. 15 (6): what about garages?

	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
515	Environment Commission	Parking	p. 16 (d): suggest adding pervious paving
516	Environment Commission	Parking	p. 17 (2) (at top of page, regarding loading): suggest more clearly defining each truck type with a loading berth size and radius, and listing numbers and sizes of each truck type to be provided for. I design loading bays often, and without knowing what size truck bays and turning radii to provide for, design would be difficult.
517	Environment Commission	Parking	p. 20 (C): "of a main entrance or all entrances." - this is unclear. Which is it, one main entrance or all of them?
518	Environment Commission	Parking	p. 20 (D) last word should have an "S" on the end? (and delete the word "a" just before "main entrance" in the last sentence).
519	Environment Commission	Parking	p. 21: (iv): the DC code is the same, and can be difficult to work with bike racks. What bike rack works with this bike parking space size?
520	Environment Commission	Parking	p. 22 (2) (iv): first word should start with a "W"?
521	Environment Commission	Parking	p. 23 (3) (a) suggest deleting "from" (fourth to last word).
522	Environment Commission	Parking	p. 23 (3) (c): do these work with the 2' x 6' space requirement?
523	Environment Commission	Parking	Page 2 #4(b) – I think this is good but where does the 10% come from? Is this arbitrary? What about additional mitigation steps to ensure that environmentally sensitive areas are not impacted at all.
524	Environment Commission	Parking	Page 11 (section f) #2 – What about reserving spots for car pool groups? Is that within the purview of this document?
525	Environment Commission	Parking	I do not understand the wording of Section (e) on page 13. Is this saying that if a development has not way of complying with conservation requirements or environmental mandates then they can go ahead and construct the parking they need regardless? I hope I am misinterpreting.
526	Environment Commission	Parking	Page 15 #7 – Does this apply to all development projects? Does this mean that parking can overflow into a neighborhood or pre-established residential area.
527	Environment Commission	Parking	Page 16 Section d – Some mention of pervious pavement options should be given other than lumping them under section d(4). This should be encouraged instead of generically lumping it under "Other paving options..."
528	Environment Commission	Parking	Also, when discussing the drainage from parking facilities there should be something mentioned about protecting nearby streams or waterways. Riparian buffers were mentioned briefly earlier (Page 2) but when discussing drainage, I think that protecting surrounding natural resources should be paramount. Parking areas should be mandated to control run-off and not by simply allowing it to flow into a storm drain.
529	Environment Commission	Parking	Page 16 section (g) – Should require the use of energy efficient lighting. Is that within the purview of this document?
530	Environment Commission	Parking	As a means of increasing public safety, what about including emergency phones or some way of alerting emergency personnel of a problem.
531	Holland & Knight	Parking	The proposed Ordinance employs a tradition suburban approach to parking to an area that is rapidly becoming more urbanized. In general, the Ordinance should do more to encourage reductions in parking, especially in transit oriented areas. This is especially important if the Ordinance continues to provide for minimum parking requirements, instead of setting forth maximum standards which can not be exceeded. In particular, the restaurant parking requirements are exceedingly high, including the requirements for restaurants within hotels.
532	Rockshire HOA	Planned Development	"Can Mansionization Occur in our PD with the proposed standards? If they can we need a balance"
533	Holland & Knight	Planned Development	Section 25.14.07. Planned Development Zones: The Article needs to recognize and strictly honor previously approved plans and agreements, whether they be annexation agreements, Preliminary Development Plans, Use Permits or Detailed Plans. Many of the planned developments have either binding resolutions or Preliminary Development Plans that clearly provide for the development which is to occur on a specific site. At the same time however, these approvals may not have the same level of detail that would exist under the proposed zone. Strict adherence to Subsection 4 could require the City to apply the details of a new zone to a previously approved development (in instances where the approved zone was silent on a particular issue), only to adversely affect the existing approvals. For instance, the imposition of the layback provision (a provision that does not exist under the existing Zoning Ordinance), would significantly impact the design and density of most previously approved projects. Yet the height and massing of these projects were comprehensively evaluated at the time the projects were approved.
534	HDC	Policy	Further, language describing M&C's role in Map Amendment process: why is this so difficult? It should be simplified to reflect that nominated properties should have a public hearing and review. Question of whether or not the public hearing could be held prior to the actual Map Amendment filing? [Com. van Balgooy] Staff commented that this is the standard Map Amendment process to change the zoning.
535	Env. Staff	Signs	Article 18 – 25.18.04 b. 10 p. 4: Can restaurants still put out temporary, portable free-standing signs advertising daily specials, etc? I think they should be allowed to so...



G			
	A	B	
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
536	Staff	SPA Process	Article 7 – Need to find a way to tighten up the provisions and/or enforcement of the temporary occupancy permits. Once we let the building be occupied, we have little or no recourse if they don't complete all their conditions of approval. Maybe impose a fine?
537	Staff	SPA Process	Are new uses proposed in a PD zone development a reason for requiring a project plan? Or only if the use was not previously allowed in the old procedure
538	Environment Commission	SPA Process	Bring back the floating zones
539	Max van Balgooy	SPA Process	The HDC should be much more active and integrated in the overall planning process (becoming involved early in the process) and is charged with responsibilities to engage the community in preservation and its heritage
540	Max van Balgooy	SPA Process	...be more public and open about the demolition permitting process and have every demolition reviewed by the HDC (not just those over 50 years old).
541	Max van Balgooy	SPA Process	...in favor of the scoring system of development projects, but like to consider if a site has an existing building and if the applicant is proposing demolition award points based on size
542	Max van Balgooy	SPA Process	Get the HDC involved much earlier in the process perhaps by including the HDC in a joint meeting with the PC and M&C for major projects
543	Citizen	SPA Process	Should a committee be created to review architectural elements of projects?
544	HDC	SPA Process	Should the SPA process require whether or not there are already identified archaeological resources on new construction on the site in their applications/reports?
545	Staff	SPA Process	Possibly add fines for temporary occupancy permit if occupant fails to conform to conditions in a timely manner
546	Staff	SPA Process	Perhaps a Joint M&C/PC meeting may not be productive
547	Staff	SPA Process	, 14 day for change in application maybe more for M&C instead of what's proposed and these should be business days not calendar days
548	Env. Staff	SPA Process	Article 5 – 25.05.01 exemptions p. 1: Waivers for windmills and solar panels?
549	Env. Staff	SPA Process	Article 5 – 25.05.01 exemptions p. 1: Is j. direct TV?
550	Env. Staff	SPA Process	Article 5 – 25.05.03 e. additional notice p. 5: At this point, web postings should no longer be considered optional or voluntary.
551	Env. Staff	SPA Process	Article 6 – 25.06.01 d. local amendment application p. 2: Should be required that it is posted on the City website – more and more functions will be migrating online.
552	Env. Staff	SPA Process	Article 6 – 25.06.02 d. referring apps p. 4: Should a subset of applications also be referred to the Environment Commission? Including, green buildings, energy efficiency and stream buffers.
553	Env. Staff	SPA Process	Article 6 – 25.06.03 d. referring apps p. 5: Variances and special exemptions should also go to the Environment Commission when they involve stream buffers, green buildings and any other relevant topic.
554	Env. Staff	SPA Process	Article 7 – 25.07.02 Notification table p. 4: Add Environmental sensitivity considerations to this notification table- eg proximity to waterway, park, etc.
555	Env. Staff	SPA Process	Article 7 – 25.07.02 Notification table p. 4: replace "detached unit" to "detached residential"
556	Env. Staff	SPA Process	Article 7 – 25.07.03 h. p. 6: It is our understanding that, based on the point system, a single residential home would fall under a Level 2 Plan review. Is this really needed for the construction of an individual new home?
557	HDC	SPA Process	Article 4: The description of the duties for the HDC seems passive, and could be more active. [Com. van Balgooy] Staff asked if this might better go into the Rules of Procedure for the HDC instead of the Zoning Ordinance? Or perhaps in Policies and Goals of the Comprehensive Master Plan? Staff to check 66B and propose broader/active language for the HDC to review.
558	HDC	SPA Process	Article 7: New ordinance proposes bringing in HDC/historic review at the 1st steps. But, this needs to be explicit in the code, to avoid confusion or last minute HDC reviews. Also, HDC is underutilized and could be involved in all complex projects. [Com. van Balgooy] Can the HDC actually request the site plan process? Could add such a requirement under (f)(1)(a)? [Com. Moloney] What documents will be referred to? PC is gathering them. [PC Com. Tyner] Staff noted that a point system is used in the County, but this draft incorporates changes. What about adding demolition dumping and sustainability issues into the point system? To discourage demolition and raise the bar and encourage sustainability. And to also note that the land isn't empty, but may have buildings and significant trees, etc. [Com. van Balgooy] Questions about exemptions for HD properties: all new items are geared to saving historic structures; but, doesn't change HDC review process or setbacks. Concern about jurisdiction for resources visible from the right of way. [Com. Van Balgooy] Staff noted this is clarified in Article 66b.
559	HP Staff	SPA Process	Needs to acknowledge process when abutting, adjacent or confronting historic resources
560	HP Staff	SPA Process	Bring in HDC for review of new construction
561	Anonymous Citizen via David Hill	Uses	Citizen wants home-based dentist office to be grandfathered. Details of request/suggestions are in email and public comments binder



	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
562	Unknown	Uses	Add a life care facility as an SE use in the residential zones
	Staff	Uses	Home-based Business Enterprise – A number of comments stating that for a minor HBBE the requirement for registering and keeping a visit log is onerous and intrusive. Staff comment that we should put some limit on the amount of the floor area used for the HBBE, so that it remains “subordinate and incidental”. For major HBBE's, there should be some provision for emergency visits during off-hours.
563			
564	Staff	Uses	Article 15 – Need to add in a provision for life care facilities; maybe track the elderly housing provisions
	W. Thomas	Uses	Limit them to no more than 30 days.
565	Curtis		
566	Citizen	Uses	In mixed use zones there is not a requirement that there be a mix of uses. Was this on purpose? Is this a good idea?
567	Citizen	Uses	Consider creating incentives for local businesses to take root in Mixed Use Zones
	Citizen	Uses	Didn't support accessory apartments because of Montgomery College
568			
	Staff	Uses	Suggestion to limit Home Based Businesses square footage in the home
569			
	Staff	Uses	For Home Based Businesses, define "subordinate"
570			
571	HDC	Uses	In the Park Zone, some of the sites may include recreational uses that would harm historic resources that are also located on the site
572	Citizen	Uses	Concern that requiring fees to register home based businesses with the City is too intrusive.
	Linda Ekizian	Uses	Would a science center permitted as an “institutional use” in either the MXT or MXB zones?
573			
574	Env. Staff	Uses	Why can't the zoning be form-based? Wouldn't that be better then trying to restrict or allow certain uses? Right now the assignments seem arbitrary.
575	Env. Staff	Uses	Dry cleaning facilities need their own line as a “use” in all of the use tables for the different zones. They use potentially hazardous chemicals.
576	Env. Staff	Uses	This code should promote and encourage mixed-use redevelopment wherever possible.
577	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 9 – 25.09.02 table p. 1: We need an exemption for windmills and solar collectors re. Height.
578	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 9 – 25.09.07 3. p. 8: What about moving trucks and construction vehicles.
579	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 9 – 25.09.07 b. p. 9: Make sure telecommuting is not restricted in the minor home-based business section.
580	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 9 – 25.09.07 b. 10 p. 10: Add electrical generating equipment.
	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 10 – overall comment: This is covered in the mixed use zoning section (mixed use neighborhood commercial) but it is worth highlighting here. It is very important to have commercial/business areas located within walking distance of these low-density areas. They should be designed to promote walkable access thus reducing the use of cars.
581			
582	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 10 – 25.10.05 table of dimensional standards p. 5: Remember storage collection devices such as rain barrels and cisterns should also be excluded.
	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 10 – 25.10.05 d. p. 6: Why is all residential development in R-LD automatically excluded from the pervious surface requirement? These facilities should be able to petition for more impervious cover, but total exclusion should not be automatic without consideration of the specifics of each facility.
583			
584	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 11 – 25.11.03 Table p. 3: Why no neighborhood center with food, supermarkets, restaurants allowed?
585	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 12 – 25.12.01 b. p. 1: General retail should be commercial not light industrial. This discourages mixed-use developments.
586	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 12 – 25.12.01 b. p. 1: General retail should be commercial not light industrial. This discourages mixed-use developments.
	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5: a. Do we really want live/work units permitted in all commercial and light industrial zones or should this be conditional? From an environmental perspective, the concept is really good. However there may be some inappropriate places within these zones.
587			
588	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5: d. What about a free-standing wind turbine or solar array permitted in the industrial zone? (smaller wind turbines and solar arrays should be permitted in all zones).
589	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5: f. Many auto repair shops also sell parts. Maybe auto repair and parts sales should be allowed in light industry zone.
	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5: f. Since you allow kennels and vet offices in light industrial zones, you may as well allow pet grooming in light industrial zones. It is often housed in the same facility.
590			
591	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5: Auto rentals should be allowed in light industrial too, no? Often places rent trucks and equipment.
592	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5: A lot of filling stations have drive through car washes. Shouldn't this be allowed in commercial?
	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 12 – 25.12.03 Table p. 2-5: Why aren't recreational facilities and recreational establishments permitted in commercial zone? There is a climbing gym in to back of Marlos right now. Is Marlos commercial or industrial?
593			
594	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 12 – 25.12.04 c. p. 7: Why is an at-grade parking structure excluded from the lot coverage? It is still covering the lot; you just get more parking for the footprint due to multiple levels.
595	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 12 – 25.12.04 d. 1. (c) p. 7: No, we want garages everywhere we can get them.

	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
596	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 13 – 25.13.01 p. 1: Overall mixed-use comment – you need a better description or definition of each mixed-use type. You should not rely on the type of business allowed in each zone to designate difference. Maybe base it on overall use.
597	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 13 – 25.13.02 table p. 2-3: The use of MXB vs. MXNC on the zoning map seems pretty arbitrary, and these two zones are very similar. Are they both necessary?
598	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 13 – 25.13.03 table p. 3-10: Change dwellings, townhouses to P in MXTD
599	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 13 – 25.13.03 table p. 3-10: Unclear why Ambulance Services are N in MXTD and MXT zones
600	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 13 – 25.13.03 table p. 3-10: Change garden produce only during months of.... To C in MXT
601	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 13 – 25.13.03 table p. 3-10: Garden Supplies is empty for MXTD zone (p6)
602	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 13 – 25.13.03 table p. 3-10: Unclear why Mutiple product range retail (dept store) is N in MXE and MXB zones
603	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 13 – 25.13.03 table p. 3-10: Caterer, no seating is empty for MXNC and MXT zones
604	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 13 – 25.13.03 table p. 3-10: Change Commercial Parking Facility to P in MXT and MXNC
605	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 13 – 25.13.03 table p. 3-10: Change Structures to P in all zones
606	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 13 – 25.13.03 table p. 3-10: Change Indoor entertainment... except shooting ranges to P in all Zones
607	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 13 – 25.13.03 table p. 3-10: Change Outdoor rec ... except shooting ranges to P in MXT & MXNC zones
608	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 13 – 25.13.03 table p. 3-10: Change Rec and spoort facility indoor commercial to P in all zones
609	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 13 – 25.13.03 table p. 3-10: Change rec establ... except shooting gallery to P in MXNC & MXT
610	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 13 – 25.13.03 table p. 3-10: Change Rental halls for meeting and social occasions to P in all zones
611	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 13 – 25.13.03 table p. 3-10: Change Theater including dinner theater to P in all zones
612	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 13 – 25.13.03 table p. 3-10: Fill in childcare section in c.
613	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 13 – 25.13.03 table p. 3-10: As in all zones, we need to consider free-standing wind turbines and/or free-standing solar arrays. They could all be "S" for mixed-use zones.
614	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 13 – 25.13.03 table p. 3-10: Commercial, office and industrial use: How about making parking structures in MXB and MXNC by special exception? Sometimes we might prefer a small parking structure to a surface lot in these locations.
615	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 13 – 25.13.03 table p. 3-10: Does Rockville currently have any shooting ranges with in the City? Do we want to start?
616	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 13 – 25.13.06 a. 5. p. 15: Antennas and satellite dishes are allowed on the roof though, right? We need to make sure solar and wind are allowed as well.
617	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 14 – 25.14.06 table p. 8: Miscellaneous uses – solar panel arrays and wind turbines (free-standing) should be either P, C or S.
618	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 15 – 25.15.02 g. p. 12: Why do we call out cosmetologists? Why not other major ones, like chiropractic. We can never guess at the major home-based businesses of the future, so why not be general?
619	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 15 – 25.15.02 g. p. 12: If this was pulled out because cosmetologists need to handle the chemicals they use very carefully and dispose of them correctly, maybe we should pull that "pre-treatment" aspect out rather than cosmetologists specifically.
620	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 15 – 25.15.02 i. p. 14: Do we need to add anything here about waste storage or other pre-treatment needs at hospitals and nursing homes?
621	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 15 – 25.15.02 p. 19: Addition – Can we add a section on wind turbines and solar arrays here?
622	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 16 – 25.16.06 b. 6. p. 15: No! We want to encourage underground garages.
623	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 16 – 25.16.07 a. p. 17: We want to encourage underground parking.
624	Env. Staff	Uses	Article 17 – 25.17.01 c. 1. (b) p. 1: Allow use for any environmental, natural resource, open space or sustainability purpose.
625	Erika Kapneck	Uses	Article 9, p. 8 working on 4 is confusing and misleading. It sounds as if a HBBE could potentially become an accessory use and would then not be permitted
626	Environment Commission	Uses	25.13.06-7 – Mechanical equipment is located outside for heat transfer requirements – the priority should be to maintain efficiency over aesthetics and noise.
627	Environment Commission	Uses	25.14.03.b.9 – Locating mechanical equipment in an inconspicuous manner is a subjective requirement. Poor location of outdoor heat transfer equipment may lead to low efficiencies and poor building performance.
628	Shulmn, Rogers, Gandal, Pordy & Ecker P.A.	Uses	Should the City decide to continue to separate "indoor" and "outdoor" dealerships, I suggest that the description of "indoor" dealership as a Conditional Use be clarified to allow for freestanding garages, and outdoor inventory display, customer and employee parking separate from the sales building.
629	Holland & Knight	Uses	25.13.03 Land Use Tables Drive-through restaurants - should be permitted in MXTD and MXE Zones. To extent this is an intensive use, these are the most intensive zones.
630	Holland & Knight	Uses	25.13.04 - Special Regulations Drive-through drug store - illogical to require drive through to be enclosed in building; wastes space; ignores reality of vehicle use; requires additional expense for air circulation and other features. Alternative buffering/screening can be provided.

G			
	A	B	
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
631	Holland & Knight	Uses	25.13.04 - Special Regulations Drive through banks - illogical to require drive thoughts in MXTD to be enclosed in building. See comments above (Drive through drug store)
632	Holland & Knight	Uses	25.13.04 - Special Regulations Commercial parking facilities - undefined; does this apply to parking for use on the same site? May be located at the back of a site where it is undesirable/infeasible to have ground level commercial uses.
633	Holland & Knight	Uses	Central features and community spaces - requirement for two public use spaces imposes significant design constraints; provision of one public use space may be challenging enough.
634	Holland & Knight	Uses	Delivery - Zoning Ordinance should not dictate hours of delivery; outside Zoning Ordinance authority.
635	Holland & Knight	Uses	Delivery trucks - not to be parked with engines running - not a zoning issue.
636	Holland & Knight	Uses	MXE Use Table allows for multi-family as a permitted use. These requirements suggest it is a conditional use. (b) no basis for limiting residential uses to 20% in office buildings. What is objective?
637	Citizen	Uses	Page 9-11: 25.09.07 c 5. Does someone giving piano lessons have to register as a Home Based Business?
638	Citizen	Uses	Page 15-9: 25.15.02 c 6 (a) (iii). Cannot sell food?
639	George Son HWA Chang	Zoning Map	Citizen suggests that his property, 100 S Adams be rezoned MXT so that he can use it as an office. Citizen believes that the Comp. Master Plan supports this as well. Draft Map zones this property as R-90.
640	RORZOR	Zoning Map	placing the Public Park zone on the public school sites, as per the Committee's vote
641	Recs & Parks	Zoning Map	Consider putting the Park zone on the PD park areas
642	Environment Commission	Zoning Map	In favor of the Park Zone
643	Max van Balgooy	Zoning Map	Simplify the process of historic designation which would help meet the State's goal to streamline the regulatory mechanisms. ...Can't find why M&C files a Sectional Map Amendment before its public hearing on designation. The HDC and M&C should both agree that a property is historic in an open and public manner, then the staff can go through the technical regulatory process to implement designations (eg map amendments, agreements with City Master Plan, etc)
644	Citizen	Zoning Map	Add a layer to the Zoning map that shows neighborhood boundaries and neighborhoods physically labeled online
645	Ziggy	Zoning Map	Dissatisfied with MXT zoning of his property. He feels that this is too limiting and that the City benefits from stores like his
646	Unknown	Zoning Map	Suggestion to rezone Avalon Bay property (Twinbrook Metro Station) from IL to one that supports multi-family development much like Twinbrook Commons
647	Barbara Sears/ Linowes and Blocher Attorneys at Law	Zoning Map	The property, 12720 Twinbrook Pkwy would like to be rezoned from its Currently proposed MXE to MXTD so the it may build building that supports a more appropriate, residential use
648	Citizen	Zoning Map	The property that faces Frederick, facing the cemetery should not be zoned anything but residential (Currently proposed to be zoned MXT)
649	Citizen	Zoning Map	Not in favor of allowing Industrial Uses so close to the neighborhood
650	Citizen	Zoning Map	Mary Trumbo Park is missing from Zoning Map
651	Citizen	Zoning Map	Burgundy shopping center should be zoned Commercial, not MXNC
652	Staff	Zoning Map	Floating zones should be revisited
653	Staff	Zoning Map	Concern that no new RTHs can be created
654	Citizen	Zoning Map	Request to rezone Burgundy Shopping Center as Commercial as opposed to the proposed MXNC
655	Linda Ekizian	Zoning Map	The ERNP calls for the re-alignment of North and South Stonestreet . The implementation of such a recommendation filtered in the Stonestreet Implementation Task Force discussion. I raise this issue now since the zoning map indicates the structure of North and South Stonestreet Avenue as it currently exists. However, any future re-alignment may cause a fluctuation in the zones. Should this be addressed in the zoning recommendations or is the zoning map a de facto representation of current and future street re-alignment?

	A	B	G
1	Source	Issue/ Article	Comment
656	Linda Ekizian	Zoning Map	Can the MCPS property zone change from R 60 to MXT (east side) and MXB (west side)
657	Env. Staff	Zoning Map	Need more comprehensive inclusion of buffer zones around streambeds and building restrictions on slopes.
658	Env. Staff	Zoning Map	Article 13 – 25.13.01 p. 1: Why is such a small proportion zoned mixed use?
659	Env. Staff	Zoning Map	Article 13 – 25.13.02 table p. 2-3: Make sure that the MXNC is close enough (and accessible via walking or biking) to residential zones. A major goal should be to reduce the need for driving. Walkable, pedestrian centered design should be promoted or required in these zones.
660	Env. Staff	Zoning Map	Article 14 – 25.14.06 table p. 8: Are there places that are nor currently parks but are zoned as parks (like stream buffers that we want to get back to open space)? Can this happen? When residents want to sell, the City buys the land at market price. This would be helpful in the Cabin John Watershed.
661	Env. Staff	Zoning Map	Article 21 – 25.21.14 p. 10: Can cluster development get a zone? Or be part of a zone definition?
662	Env. Staff	Zoning Map	Map section: Consider adding individual maps for each zone.
663	HP Staff	Zoning Map	Change zoning of mixed use near his dis
664	HP Staff	Zoning Map	Concern that surrounding zones may be increasing value of land, putting pressure to sell His Dis. Economic Hardship
665	HP Staff	Zoning Map	The two small triangular parks zoned MXCD that we suggest be rezoned Park Zone are two parcels that make up the corners of Jefferson and Maryland, and Maryland and Courthouse Square that are part of the environmental setting for the Red Brick Courthouse. The MXCD zone would allow 120' high construction on these parcels (which are county owned).
666	HP Staff	Zoning Map	Staff suggests that the block with contains the red brick courthouse and possibly also South Washington Street, which would bring the maximum height down to 50' instead of 120. (MXCD to MXNC -- or mixed-use corridor district to mixed-use neighborhood commercial). We thought this would create a stronger transition zone leading up to the Town Center.
667	HP Staff	Zoning Map	the lot that shares a block with the PD-DB (Planned Development Duball) is the white painted brick 1962 office building that is on the northwest corner of Maryland and Courthouse Square ( address is 32 Courthouse Square). This would lower the maximum height from 120' to 50'. The existing building is height is 4 stories and we feel a 120' height limit would be an invitation to demolition. Also, the lower height would create a stronger transition zone as in #3.
668	Citizen	Zoning Map	There should be at least one more commercial district zone to provide better commercial zone flexibility.
669	Citizen	Zoning Map	The mixed-use zones replace some of the current commercial zones. An additional lower-density mixed-use zone should be offered.
670	Citizen	Zoning Map	Proposed Draft Map Amendment: The PD zones don't have the suffixes. These should be present so that the match the text. Also, need a neighborhood overlay.